

Some Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of the Albigenses

By Peter Allix

1690, 1821

Oxford: At the Clarendon Press

[**Note from the publisher.** This valuable out-of-print book was carefully formatted for electronic publication by Way of Life Literature. For a catalog of other books, both current and old, in print and electronic format, contact us at fbns@wayoflife.org or on the web at www.wayoflife.org.]



Bibles burned by Catholic authorities in 15th century England

CONTENTS

LETTER TO THE QUEEN

PREFACE

CHAPTER 1 - Concerning the original of the Churches of Gallia Narbonensis and Aquitain

CHAPTER 2 - The faith of the Church of the Gauls in the second century

CHAPTER 3 - The faith of Gallia Aquitanica and Narbonensis in the fourth century

CHAPTER 4 - An examination of the opinions of Vigilantius

CHAPTER 5 - The state of the Churches of Aquitain and Narbon in the fifth century

CHAPTER 6 - The state of these dioceses in the sixth century

CHAPTER 7 - The state of the dioceses of Aquitain and Narbon in the seventh century

CHAPTER 8 - The opinion of the Churches of Aquitain and Narbon in the eighth century

CHAPTER 9 - The faith of the Churches of Aquitain and Narbon in the ninth century

CHAPTER 10 - The state of these dioceses in the tenth century

CHAPTER 11 - The beginning of the Manichees in Aquitain, and the state of those Churches as to religion in that age

CHAPTER 12 - That these dioceses continued independent of the Popes, until the beginning of the twelfth century

CHAPTER 13 - Of the opposition that was made by a part of these Churches to the attempts of the Popes, and of their separation from the communion of Rome, before Peter Waldo

CHAPTER 14 - Of the opinions of Peter de Bruis and Henry, and their disciples, and whether they were Manichees or not

CHAPTER 15 - That it doth not appear from the Conference of Alby, that the Albigenses were Manichees

CHAPTER 16 - The Albigenses justified by a conference, whereof we have an account

written by Bernard of Foncaud

CHAPTER 17 - The calumnies raised against the Albigenses, refuted by the Conference at Montreal

CHAPTER 18 - Reflections on the convictions of Manicheism, which were said to be proved upon the Albigenses

CHAPTER 19 - Whether the Albigenses were Manichees, because they accused the Pope of being the Antichrist

CHAPTER 20 - Of the morals of the Albigenses, and of their ecclesiastical government

CHAPTER 21 - Concerning the persecutions which the Albigenses have suffered from the Pope and his party

CHAPTER 22 - That the doctrine of the Albigenses spread itself in England, and continued there till the time of the Reformation The petition of the Lollards

CHAPTER 23 - Of the doctrine of Wicklef and his disciples in England

CHAPTER 24 - Of the calumnies that have been unjustly charged upon Wicklef by the Papists

CHAPTER 25 - That the doctrine of the Albigenses was propagated in Spain, and that it continued there till the Reformation

CONCLUSION

EXTRACTS - Of several trials of some pretended heretics in the diocese of Sarum. Taken out of an old Register

THE LIFE OF PETER ALLIX (1641-1717) - The following is from the Introduction to the Church History Research & Archives (1989) edition of Allix's *Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Ancient Churches of Piedmont* --

Peter Allix was born in France in 1641 and died in London in 1717. Though he was not a Baptist, he was a learned scholar and historian of the Church of England. He penned over twenty-five published works from 1672 to 1711, including the two histories on the Churches of Piedmont and of the Albigenses. These two works are widely accepted and treasured by Baptists. Many later historians who reference Peter Allix's writings include David Benedict, Adam Blair, Joseph Bingham, William Jarrell, William Jones, John Lawrence, Mosheim, G.H. Orchard, and Robert Robinson.

TO THE QUEEN

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR MAJESTY,

This defense of the Albigenses, the ancient and illustrious Confessors, who some ages ago enlightened the southern parts of France, is laid down at your Majesty's feet for your protection, as well as their successors do now fly into your dominions for relief. That charity which moves your Majesty to protect them by your gracious favor, and support them by your royal bounty, makes me presume to offer this historical apology to your sacred Majesty.

Their faith was in most things the same with that which our Reformers taught in opposition to the Church of Rome; and after all the endeavors that have been used to blacken them by the most horrid calumnies, as well as to destroy them by the cruellest inquisitions and croisades, the innocence of their lives, and the exemplariness of their deaths, makes them to be justly gloried in as the true authors of the Reformation. It was from them that this Church (now so happy in your Majesty) received the first beams of that heavenly light which it now enjoys, and which it of late maintained with such vast advantages, that it is deservedly esteemed the chief body, as well as the justest glory, of the whole Reformation. The persecutions of those earliest restorers of the doctrine of Jesus Christ drove them out of their country, and forced many to fly into this kingdom for shelter, who brought with them the first seeds of those truths which have since yielded so plentiful an increase. There is nothing in this history that will either strike or charm. Those true disciples of their crucified Master were considerable for nothing but the purity of their doctrine, the innocence of their lives, and the patience as well as the constancy of their sufferings. But the glories of this world which surround your Majesty do not darken or lessen in your esteem these distinguishing characters of the religion of Christ our Savior, and of those his suffering members, in whose afflictions you are pleased to take so great a share, that you do very much diminish their own sense of them, and make them so much the easier by those vast supports you give them. May that God who has raised up your Majesty to support religion, and protect its confessors in their lowest circumstances, and who has so miraculously preserved and prospered the King and your Majesty in opposition to the enemies and persecutors of his truth, still pour down the richest of his blessings upon your Majesties; may you perfect what you have so gloriously begun; may you be long, great and happy here, and infinitely greater and happier for ever. These are the daily wishes and most earnest prayers of,

May it please your Majesty, Your Majesty's most dutiful, most faithful, and most obedient subject,

PETER ALLIX.

THE PREFACE

It was no hard matter for us to justify the Waldenses from the accusation of schism, which the Bishop of Meaux thought fit to charge upon them; for, by shewing the antiquity, purity, and succession of those churches, I have made it appear, that what the Bishop calls schism, ought in justice to be looked upon as a vigorous opposition to the false worship and usurpations of the Romish faction; and by consequence, that there is no more reason to call the Waldenses schismatics, because of their refusing subjection to the Pope, and rejecting the errors of the Church of Rome, than there is to call the Church of England schismatical for the same reasons.

But it is so long since the heads of the Church of Rome have founded their design of an universal monarchy, and so have fitted their style to their pretensions, that it is now become a very familiar thing with them, to treat those as rebels and schismatics, who will not submit to their authority: so that we need not wonder, if they, who have espoused the interest of the Church of Rome, and who defend her against the Protestants, do boldly charge those with schism against whom they write, without giving themselves the trouble of proving their charge.

Nay, perhaps we are to think ourselves obliged to the Bishop of Meaux, who, raising himself a little above the common method of the Doctors of his own communion, has limited himself to accuse the Waldenses of schism only, whereas he might with as much reason have charged them with heresy, if he had followed the writers of controversy of his own party, or the legends of the saints of his communion. For it is certain, that the writers of controversy in the Church of Rome, and those who have writ the lives of those Inquisitors that have been canonized, have never looked upon the Waldenses as any other than Manichees; so thoroughly rooted is the spirit of calumny in the members of that Church: the character of father of lies being very necessary to support that of murderer honourably, whereof they have been in possession so very long.

I cannot tell whether the Bishop of Meaux has forgiven himself for his tenderness towards the Waldenses, whom he only treats as schismatics. For seeing one day informs another, and that thus men come to refine their notions to the utmost, who knows but the Bishop, who, when he writ his Book of Variations, had only obscurely hinted, that to accuse the Pope of being Antichrist was a character of Manicheism; who knows, I say, but that now he sees so clearly that the Waldenses have formally declared that the Pope is Antichrist, he will not anew make them Manichees once more, the better to accommodate himself with the maxims of his new system? If he should not do it himself, to avoid the shame of being guilty of a variation, at least it is very obvious to believe, that some of those who are engaged with him in the same cause will not fail of taking that course; and therefore I am glad I have prevented him, by showing that the Waldenses were no Manichees, though they took the Pope to be Antichrist.

Be it as it will, I hope it will not be harder for us to justify the Albigenses from the accusations brought against them by the Bishop of Meaux. He uses his utmost endeavors to maintain a most abominable calumny raised by his predecessors, and strives, by representing the Albigenses as a people who had revived the errors of the Manichees, to make them equally odious to those of the Church of Rome, and the Protestants of France, whom his violence, together with that of his colleagues, have forced to take upon them the external profession of Popery.

The Jews built the tombs of those prophets whom their fathers slew; process of time having cured them of their fury, that enraged their forefathers against the ambassadors of heaven. Those of the Church of Rome only know not what it is to disown the rage and slanders of their predecessors. She has accused the Albigenses of Manicheism, and has done it on purpose to inspire her votaries with a barbarous cruelty against a people who refused to bear the yoke of her tyranny: and it is to please her, that her ministers must still go on to tear the memory of those faithful servants of God, for the utter extirpation of whom she formerly armed the hands of all the furious zealots of her communion.

And as in handling the history of the Waldenses, I thought needful, for the satisfaction of the reader, to make some remarks on their original, their succession, their separation from the Church of Rome, and their ministry; so I intend now to follow the same method exactly in these observations on the history of the Albigenses; and I hope this will be equally useful, to shew what care God hath taken to preserve these other illustrious witnesses of his truth, notwithstanding all those corruptions that overspread the churches of the west.

I have set down the character of the Manichees, both ancient and modern, in my Remarks upon the History of the Churches of Piedmont, so fully, that it will not be necessary to repeat what I say there in this treatise. 1. Because it is certain, that it was rather humor in the Bishop of Meaux, that he did not accuse them of Manicheism, than any due regard to truth, the Waldenses having been as much accused of Manicheism as the Albigenses; neither are there any more solid proofs to convict the Albigenses of those errors, than the Waldenses. 2. Because this new hypothesis of the Bishop of Meaux, wherein he asserts, that to accuse the Pope of being Antichrist is a character of Manicheism, is so excessively ridiculous, that it is hard to guess, how even the Bishop himself could ever give entertainment to it.

It is a very surprising thing to see the Bishop maintain, in his new Commentary upon the Revelation, that the prophecies of St. John concerning Antichrist were actually accomplished above one thousand two hundred years since. Antichrist then must have made his escape in the crowd, without being at all perceived; for the greatest lights of the Church, and those who had their eyes most open to discover him, never perceived any thing of all this. Vega and Ribera, who have written on the Revelations with as much learning as the Bishop of Meaux, were never able to make any discovery in ancient history that could be applicable to the Apocalypse; and all the Romish writers of controversy must have been a company of asses, not to stumble upon so easy an answer, which would eternally have stopped the mouths of the Protestants in so ticklish and tender a point.

But it is no matter, since two Protestant authors, and those of the first rank too, Grotius and Hammond, have handed this notion to the Bishop: it being very probable, that the Bishop did for this reason hinder the Clergy from putting the works of Grotius in the catalogue of books, which they forbade a little before the revocation of the edict of Nantes: and he would have been as civil to Dr. Hammond too, if his Commentary upon the New Testament had been known to him any where else than in Pool's Synopsis. And really these great men very well deserved that a particular regard should be had to them; their mistake in the point of Antichrist having proved as advantageous to the Church of Rome, as their learned works can be profitable to the Protestants.

But it is yet a more surprising thing to see the Bishop make this charge of the Albigenses against the Pope, a character of their being Manichees, which none that have ever writ against them before have taken the least notice of.

Whatever the success may be of so groundless a charge, I shall make it appear, that the Bishop of Meaux could not accuse the Albigenses, without making great numbers of his best Catholics suspected, and abettors of the Manicheism of the Albigenses in this point.

I thought it was my duty to clear Wicklef and his disciples from the slanders cast upon them by the Bishop of Meaux: I know very well, that he has done nothing, but repeat the old calumnies wherewith the Papists formerly endeavored to blacken that great man, without taking the least notice of the apologies that have been made in his behalf. But either men must resolve never to write against these gentlemen, or be content to undergo the drudgery of repeating publicly those solid answers that have been returned to their accusations before; which the writers of the Romish party always think fit to dissemble.

I hope, however, that seeing the matter I undertake to treat of naturally engaged me to take notice of great numbers of matters of fact, which were necessary to be examined towards the clearing of this subject; and that the malice and cruelty of the enemies of these ancient Christians have robbed us of what might be most material for their justification; the reader will not expect I should put these remarks into any other form, than that in which I wrote my *Remarks upon the Ecclesiastical History of the Churches of Piedmont*. For I could neither write a continued history, nor dispense with the examination of several matters of fact, which could not be cleared so well as they ought, without some critical inquiries, that will be unpleasant to all

those who search for any thing else but truth. I have confined myself here entirely to the inquiry after and illustration of that alone; and I am persuaded, that those who will take the pains to weigh what I have said in these following sheets with care, will be of the same opinion. And I heartily wish, that it may triumph over falsehood, and innocence prevail against all the assaults of obloquy and slander.

CHAPTER 1

Concerning the original of the Churches of Gallia Narbonensis and Aquitain.

Before the Gauls were entirely reduced by Caesar under the power of the Roman empire, and after that, under the said Emperor, Gallia was commonly divided into two parts, whereof the one was called Braccata, the other Comata. Gallia Braccata contained not only that part of Italy which is beyond the Alps, and was named Cisalpina, but also Gallia Narbonensis, whereof Vienna was the capital city. The other, to wit, Gallia Comata, was divided into three parts; the first whereof was called Belgica, the other Celtica, and the third Aquitain. But Augustus being absolute master of Gaul, made some alteration in this division; for he extended the bounds of Aquitain by restraining those of Celtica, and distinguished Aquitain into three provinces, whereof the first and second were on this side of the Garonne, and reached to the Loire; the third reached from the Garonne to the Pyrenean mountains. Bourges and Bourdeaux were the mother cities of the first and second of these provinces; and Eulse or Eaulse was the metropolis of the third; which city having been destroyed by the wars, Auch succeeded her in that dignity. As for Gallia Narbonensis, which at first was only a province, whereof Vienna was the capital city, Augustus was pleased to take that honor from her, to bestow it upon Lyons, which seemed to him more commodious to be made the seat of government. This province was afterwards changed, by being divided into four parts, viz. into Narbonensis, Viennensis, the Maritime Alps, and the Greek Alps. And after this division, Narbonensis was again subdivided into two parts, the first and second, as may be seen since the fourth century. It was needful, at the entrance of this discourse, to give the reader this short draught of the countries that went under the name of Gallia, to give him an idea of that part of them, where we intend to shew him the continuation of that Church which gave birth to the Albigenses, and furnished the west with witnesses of so great weight against the corruptions of the Romish party; and indeed though the Visi-Goths, who cut off these provinces from the Roman empire, and afterwards the French, who destroyed the Visi-Goths in the time of Clovis, made very great changes in this division of Gallia Narbonensis and Aquitain, yet we may exactly observe, that the Church of these provinces hath well nigh always made a distinct body by her synods and canons.

It is a matter of difficulty precisely to fix the first rise of these Churches. I own that some Greek Fathers have believed, that St. Luke and Crescens, disciples of St. Paul, did preach the Gospel in Gallia; but that which engaged them in this opinion seems of little or no solidity. And the Galatia mentioned by St. Paul in the second of Timothy, doth not signify Gallia, but a province of the lesser Asia, as the learned Petavius acknowledgeth. Others have believed, that St. Paul himself preached the Gospel in these provinces, as he passed through them in his way to Spain, where the fourth century took it for granted that he preached the Gospel: but neither doth this seem grounded upon sufficient authority; and we do not find that the ancient authors of these countries did ever maintain any such thing. Should we indeed, as to this point, give credit to the most part of the Romish legends, to which Baronius in his Annals pays too great a deference, it would be an easy matter to give to the most part of these Churches a most august original. We might suppose that St. Peter and St. Paul were the founders of them by the ministry of their disciples, or that Clement, Bishop of Rome, sent them thither almost immediately after the martyrdom of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul. They tell us, that Paul was the first Bishop of Narbon, Saturninus of Toulouse, Martialis of Limoges, Frontinus of Perigueux, Vincentius of Daeqs, Georgius of Puy, Eutropius of Xaintes: much like as for some ages since, in most of the other Churches of France, they suppose that the first Bishops were sent them by the same Apostles, or by their first successors.

But we meet with nothing but falsities in these pretended traditions: and it is impossible to reconcile them with what Sulpicius Severus and Gregorius Turonensis tell us concerning the rise of Christian religion among the Gauls. The former of these distinctly assures us, that Gaul never had any martyrs before the empire of Aurelius, son of Antoninus, Hist. lib. 2. Sub Aurelio, Antonini filio, persecutio quinta agitata; ac tunc primum inter Gallias martyria visa, serius trans Alpes Dei religione suscepta: "The fifth persecution was carried on under Aurelius, Antonine's son; and then first were martyrdoms seen among the Gauls, the Divine religion having been later entertained beyond the Alps."

This single period of Severus gives sentence against all those pretended martyrs wherewith the Churches of France have filled their Breviaries. The latter tells us plainly, that it was not till the empire of Decius, about the year 250, that the city of Toulouse had for her first Bishop Saturninus, who was sent from Rome in company of six others, into the country of the Gauls, to preach the Gospel; to wit, Gatian at Tours, Trophimus at Arles, Paul at Narbon, Dionysius at Paris, Austremoine at Clermont, and Martialis at Limoges. This is that which is clearly proved from the acts of the Martyrdom of St. Saturninus, cited by Gregory, Bishop of Tours.

These testimonies of two ancient authors, the one of the fifth century, and the other more ancient, viz. the same who wrote the Martyrdom of St. Saturninus, have made such an impression upon some of the learnedest men of the Roman communion, viz. upon Bosquet, Bishop of Montpellier, Sirmond, and Launoy, the famous Doctor of the Faculty of Paris, as to make them with scorn reject those legends, which ascribe more ancient founders to these Churches, notwithstanding that they are the greatest ornament of the Breviaries of the Gallican Church, and that they cannot lose their credit, without shaking the belief of abundance of miracles, and the authority of a great number of devotions.

And indeed, what reason is there to own a tradition for authentic, which we scarcely find backed with any witness for the space of above seven hundred years? Besides, do not we know, that it was the dispute about precedency between the Churches in the eighth and ninth century, and which we find lasted till the twelfth, that engaged the several parties to devise this great antiquity, and boldly change that, which before had been the current belief of their Churches, because it did not answer their pretensions, nor comport with their vanity, to substitute instead thereof fabulous originals, under whose shelter they might maintain a dispute with more advantage against those that were on even ground with them? But however it be difficult to fix the certain original of these Churches; for the Gothic Liturgy, which was used in these provinces, assures us that St. Saturninus came from Smyrna, from whence it should seem that the first founders of the Churches of Lyons and Vienna came likewise; yet thus much we may assert, that the Gospel soon took deep root there.

My design is not to refute here what the authors of the legends have inserted in their fabulous relations, concerning the establishment of the Christian religion in these provinces, and the character of the piety of those first founders of Christianity, of their precepts and of their miracles. Indeed there is reason to deplore either the boundless impudence of the Pastors of the Roman communion, in obtruding such palpable falsities, or the prodigious stupidity of the people of that Church, who feed themselves with stories more fabulous than those of Amadis of Gaul, and make them the subject of their devotion. We read in the life of St. Martialis, that after the saint had converted Limoges, he there consecrated Churches to the honor of Jesus Christ, of the holy Virgin, and St. Stephen, whose cousin he was. We read that he raised to life the Priests of the idol, whom God had struck dead with a clap of thunder, for their poisoning St. Martialis; and that, after their resurrection, he converted them. We find that he admitted to the vow of virginity a person called Valeria, who some time after having had her head cut off, by order of the Duke of Guienne, whose courtship she had slighted, immediately took up her head, and carried it to St. Martialis, as he was saying Mass. We find him there going to Rome, to give an account to St. Peter of his commission: all this is very gravely related by the Legendaries; yea, the impudence of these knaves proceeded to that point, as in the ninth century to conciliate authority to these fabulous relations. Several councils were assembled at Limoges, where, with intolerable impudence, they imposed two epistles upon St. Martialis, the one as writ to those of Toulouse, and the other to those of Bourdeaux, and which bear much a like resemblance to the apostolical writings of those times, as asses do to lions: and all that these insipid authors tell us about it, is so entirely framed according to the manners, notions, and customs of the later ages, that we can find nothing in their writings but what some stupid Monks have insolently invented and patched together, with so little regard to reason, that one of these extravagant fellows maintains, that the blessed Virgin was saying her rosary at the time she was visited by the angel Gabriel.

It is not certainly known, whether the books which St. Irenaeus has written against the Valentinians ought to persuade us that those heretics had then already spread themselves among the Gauls; for seeing he writ them in Greek, this work seems to have been designed against the heretics of the east; for though we have a translation of these books, more ancient than the time of St. Austin, yet we have no proof that it was done with design to refute persons who had endeavored to corrupt the faith from the very beginning of its establishment in Gaul.

True it is, that in the fourth century, Arianism had considerably corrupted and infected the purity of these dioceses: Saturninus, Bishop of Aries, and those of his cabal, having condemned St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, for an heretic, because he opposed Arianism with all his might; but soon after we find that truth raised herself again from under its ruins: for though at the beginning of the fifth century the Visi-Goths, who were Arians, had made themselves masters of these provinces of the Gauls, which they remained possessed of till they were taken from them by Clovis, King of France; yet we do not find that Arianism ever prevailed there, the vigilance of the Pastors having prevented the people's yielding so far to the authority of these Arian kings, as to follow them in their error, the very nature of these disputes engaging the enemies of the Church to maintain such maxims, as put a stop to the people's superstition, with respect to the veneration of martyrs.

I am not ignorant that St. Gaudentius takes notice that several Priscillianists were scattered up and down these provinces; and Priscillianism was nothing else but Manicheism in perfection, as appears from the writings of St. Austin. But this evil plant withered soon after; both the Arians, who were masters, and the orthodox, equally joining their endeavors to confound that heresy. Neither indeed do we find, after the sixth century, any mention made of Priscillianists in these parts; so that we may affirm, that Christianity was preserved there with much purity in those primitive times, and arrived to such a degree of strength and vigor, as to banish both those heresies, whereof the one attacked the Father of our Savior, and the other denied the Divinity of the Son.

But what I have already said in general, is not sufficient to give us a competent and just idea of the Christianity which was planted in these provinces, and which the Albigenses have so happily asserted, both by their preachings and sufferings. We must therefore take a review of these primitive ages, and consider a little wherein consisted that religion which these dioceses received from those first Ministers of Jesus Christ, who conveyed thither the doctrine of the Gospel, and transmitted the same to posterity, as a sacred trust committed to them.

CHAPTER 2

The faith of the Church of the Gauls in, the second century.

We have no Gallic author whose name is so famous as St. Irenaeus: he was a disciple of St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna; and being sent into Gaul by that apostolic man, he was first Priest of the Church of Lyons, and afterwards succeeded Pothinus, first Bishop of that city: it was in his time that the Church suffered the fifth persecution under the government of the Emperors Verus and Marcus Aurelius. Eusebius has preserved the relation of the martyrdom of the believers of Lyons and Vienna, which, according to all probability, is judged to have been made by St. Irenaeus in the name of both these Churches.

This relation tells us first of all, that the Roman President having caused some slaves to be apprehended that belonged to Christians, made them confess, at the sight of tortures prepared for them, that the Christians did eat children in their assemblies, and that they there promiscuously polluted themselves by abominable incests; which was afterwards confirmed by weak Christians, who for fear of torments abjured their religion.

2. That the Christians having confuted this calumny, by their constancy in enduring the torments, and above all the rest Blandina, who after a whole day's suffering tortures, having cried with a loud voice, I am a Christian; there is no wickedness committed amongst us: (which was seconded by Byblis, who before had abjured:) How, said she, should the Christians, to whom it is not lawful to eat the blood of beasts, devour infants?

3. Blandina is represented to us in these acts, as praying to God with great affection, and as it were conversing with Jesus Christ in prayer. Attalus being set in a chair of iron, to be there burnt, and perceiving the smell of his broiled flesh, said to the spectators in Latin, *In hoc demum est homines vorare quod agitis; nos vero neque homines voramus, neque omnino quicquam mali facimus*: "This that ye do here is indeed to devour men; but as for us, we neither devour men, nor do any thing at all that is evil."

Lastly, The Church was desirous to bury what remained of their bodies, as the relation informs us, but the fury of the Pagans, who burnt them to ashes, hindered them: these are the chiefest heads of this relation, where we find nothing but God and Jesus Christ called upon; where we do not see the believers troubling themselves to explain or qualify the corporal manducation of the body of Jesus Christ, as it became them to have done, had they believed their eating of him with their bodily mouth; and where there is not the least word that might give us to understand that these Churches took care to preserve these so precious relics, to honor them with their adorations, as in latter times has been done.

We find here also the spirit of calumny transporting the heathens against the disciples of Jesus Christ; and how far the cruelty of torments may prevail to make men confess the most enormous calumnies to be true. The reader must not forget these two characters of old Rome, because the Inquisitors have renewed these very same slander against the Albigenses, and have pretended to confirm them by confessions which the cruelty of their tortures have forced from them.

Neither is it only in this work of his, that St. Irenaeus informs us, what in his time was the faith of these Churches planted in Gaul, for he hath left us five books, and Eusebius has preserved for us some epistles of that ancient Bishop, altogether refulgent with the purity of the faith delivered by the Apostles.

1. St. Irenaeus gives us this for one character of the Gnostics, that they embraced doctrines which were not to be found in the writings of the Prophets or the Apostles, lib. 1. cap. 1. p. 33.

And it is with the same spirit that he attributes to heretics the accusing of the Scripture for being unintelligible, without the help of tradition, whereas he maintains, that that which had been preached, was committed to writing by the special will of God, to the end it might be the ground and pillar of our faith, lib. 3. c. 1. et 2. And that it is to make the Apostles hypocrites, to suppose that they taught some things in public, and others in private; whence it appears clearly, that when he makes use of tradition, he only does it with respect to those scriptural doctrines which the heretics opposed, and whereof they pretended that the Apostles had left the contrary to those that succeeded them, lib. 3. c. 2. It is upon this occasion that he allegeth the testimony of the Church of Rome, founded by the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul, as of one that was most known: *Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam (saith he) propter potentioorem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam, hoc est eos qui sunt undique fideles, in quo semper ab his qui sunt undique conservata est ea, quae est ab Apostolis traditio*; "For to this Church, because of its more powerful superiority, it behoves the whole Church to come, that is, the believers of all parts, forasmuch as therein the tradition from the Apostles has always been preserved by the believers of all parts."

It is apparent, that whatsoever design he may have had to raise the authority of the Church of Rome, he makes no other use of it, than to make out that it was impossible those doctrines which the heretics gave out for apostolical should be really so, seeing they were unknown to a Church which had had the Apostles and their successors for her guides; more especially seeing that Church was placed in the very seat of the empire, which continually drew to Rome a vast number of believers from all the different places of the empire, from whence they brought not along with them a different tradition from that which they found in the bosom of the Church of Rome.

That St. Irenaeus had no other aim but this, is owned by F. Quesnel, in his notes upon the tenth Epistle of St. Leo, p. 809. And this appears evidently, because, after all that esteem which he had for the Church of Rome, he was not afraid to write to her Bishop very censuring letters, upon the account of his having excommunicated the Churches of Asia, that celebrated Easter the fourteenth of the moon of March; as also because he continued in the communion of those Churches of Asia, without being concerned at the excommunication of the Pope of Rome.

2. He reduces the whole faith of Christians throughout the world to that which we call the Apostles' Creed, without mentioning so much as a word of those doctrines which the Church of Rome has superadded to it, pretending to confirm them by tradition, lib. 1. c. 2.

3. He maintains the Scriptures to be both clear and perfect, lib. 2. c. 47.

4. He rejects the doctrines which the heretics grounded upon the explication of some parables, maintaining that nothing ought to be established but upon clear and evident places of Scripture, lib. 2. c. 46.

5. It appears by his writings, that penance at that time was public, without dispensing with women that were overtaken with the sins of uncleanness, by which means being exposed to extreme confusion, it made some of them abjure Christianity, lib. 1. c. 9.

6. He makes it appear that caelibat was not yet known in Asia, whence these first Christians of the Gauls derived their original, which is acknowledged by Feuardentius, lib. 1. c. 9.

7. He assigns to the Marcosians the custom of anointing those they received into their communion with balm, [opobalsamo,] which shews, that at that time extreme unction was not known: and we may make the same observation from his imputing to other heretics the anointing of persons at the point of death with oil and water, lib. 1. c. 18.

8. He attributes to the Gnostics the imitation of the heathens, because they had the images of Jesus Christ, lib. 1. c. 24. which makes it evident that the Christians had no images, much less that they gave to them any religious worship. And indeed we find him reasoning, lib. 2. c. 6. after such a manner as shews that the Christians were yet in full possession of a right to reproach the heathens with all those absurdities that arise from the use of images. The same may also be gathered from lib. 2. c. 42. where he divides the law

into two tables, in a manner very different from that of the Doctors of the Roman Church, and altogether conformable to the judgment of Josephus and other Jewish Doctors.

9. He makes it appear, that he knew nothing of the separability of accidents from their subjects, which is the sole support of transubstantiation, lib. 2. c. 14.

10. He in plain terms rejects the invocation of angels, instead thereof recommending that of our Savior Jesus Christ, lib. 2. c. 57.

11. He asserts that the blessed Virgin had unseasonable motions, *intempestivam festinationem*, John 2:3 so far was he from believing her wholly free from sin, lib. 2. c. 18. This shews that when he saith, cap. 33. *Quod alligavit Virgo Eva per incredulitatem, hoc Virgo Maria solvit per fidem*; "What the Virgin Eve bound up by her unbelief, that the Virgin Mary set free by her faith;" he doth not own the Virgin for the person that saved men, but his meaning is like that of Hesychius, who said, speaking of the women to whom Jesus Christ appeared after his resurrection; *Invenere enim, saith he, mulieres, quod olim amisere per Evam; lucrum invenit ea, quae damni occasionem praeberat*. "For the women found what formerly they lost by Eve; she found the gain, who had been an occasion of the loss." T.15. B. P. p. 823, col. 1.

And this is the sense likewise of that other passage of St. Irenaeus, which we find, lib. 5. c.

19. for though he calls the Virgin, Eve's advocate, it plainly appears that he meant nothing else but what is expressed by St. Chrysostom, in Ps. 44. t. 3. p. 221. *Virgo nos Paradiso expulit, per Virginem vitam aeternam invenimus*; "A Virgin drove us out of Paradise, and by a Virgin we have found eternal life."

12. That he did not believe we ought to have recourse to the intercession of saints, can be invincibly demonstrated from hence, because he did not believe that the faithful should see the face of God before the day of judgment, lib. 5. c. 3.

13. He plainly asserts that the apostolical succession is of no consideration without the truth of doctrine, lib. 4. c. 43. so far was he from making it a bar to hinder believers from examining the doctrine propounded to them.

14. He maintains that the gates of heaven were opened to Jesus Christ, because of the assumption of his flesh; so far was he from believing that his glorified body could penetrate bodies, lib. 3. c. 18. et lib. 4. c. 66.

He asserts that Jesus Christ, at his being born, opened the blessed Virgin's womb, lib. 4. c. 66. which the Church of Rome condemns for divers reasons.

And forasmuch as he holds the Holy Ghost to be the food of life, lib. 4. c. 75. accordingly he maintains, c. 2. lib. 5. that our bodies are nourished by the creatures of God received in the Eucharist, and that they receive growth by them.

He distinctly asserts, that the sacrament of the Eucharist, as to its substance, consists of bread and wine, which are the creatures of God, which he receives as oblations of a different kind from the sacrifices of the Old Testament; and, indeed, in case he had otherwise conceived the matter, he would have favored the opinion of the Gnostics, who, pretending that the work of the creation was not the work of the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, could never have lighted upon a more comfortable doctrine than that of transubstantiation, by means of which the nature of bread and wine would be destroyed by Jesus Christ in the Sacrament, and nothing left but the accidents, that is to say, mere phantoms, without any thing of reality, lib. 4. c. 34. et 57.

In like manner we find him asserting, lib. 5. c. 33. that what Jesus Christ gave to his disciples in the cup, was the generation or product of the vine. 15. We see clearly from what Eusebius has preserved of St. Irenaeus, that the variety in observing a fast before Easter was very great, and that there was no law of the

Apostles or of Jesus Christ enjoining it, every one using it according to his own free will and devotion. We find also, that whatsoever respect St. Irenaeus had for the Church of Rome, he was no more inclined to be led by her sole authority, than St. Polycarp was, whom he much commends; and if he considered her as an apostolic Church, yet he never attributed to her any authority over the other flocks of the Lord.

I will not dissemble that St. Irenaeus seems somewhat at a loss about the state of believers after death; but to this it is sufficient to say,

1. That we find in St. Irenaeus an abridgment of the faith almost in the same form that we find it in the Apostles' Creed, as it is called.

2. That if we do not agree to all the opinions of St. Irenaeus, about the state of souls after death, it is certain that the Doctors of the Church of Rome do at least reject as many articles as we do, yea, and more too. From what I have said, we may however perceive what was the state of the Christian religion in Gaul, a little after the middle of the second century, which is the time wherein St. Irenaeus lived and flourished.

I wish I could produce for the following century as authentic a witness concerning the state of the Churches in this part of Gaul; but indeed, though there were divers famous writers, whose works are cited by St. Jerome, yet there is in a manner nothing of them left to us. I know there are some who believe that Victorinus was Bishop of Poitiers in the third century; but this is not found true, for it is certain that he was Bishop of Passau Patavionensis, and not Pictaviensis; so that we must proceed to those who can inform us of the state of this part of Gaul during the fourth century.

CHAPTER 3

The faith of Gallia Aquitana and Narbonensis in the fourth century.

St. Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, a famous Confessor in the persecution which the Arians stirred up against the orthodox, can afford us much light concerning the state and faith of these dioceses: this great man was married, as he who published his works at Paris owns, after the famous *Baptista Mantuanus*, observing that the law for the celibacy of the Clergy was not yet introduced, and that before that time, as St. Jerome expreseth it, they rather made choice of married persons than unmarried, because the former were judged more proper for the functions of the holy ministry. But this is not the only article wherein he differed from Popery, as well as the Church of Aquitain.

1. He counts the canonical books as we do, and plainly holds them for apocryphal which we reject, as we find in the preface to his Commentary upon the Book of Psalms.

2. He lays it down for an error and piece of impiety to look upon the Scripture as imperfect, in Psalm 118. Lit. Vau.

3. He asserts that ignorance is not capable of excusing men, seeing the Scripture is proposed to us as the rule of our faith and manners: *Non habet veniam ignoratio voluntatis; quia sub scientiae facultate nescire, repudiatae magis, quam non repertae scientiae est reatus: ob id enim longe a peccatoribus salus, quia non exquisierint justificationes Dei: nam utique non ob aliud consignatae literis manent, quam ut ad universorum scientiam, notionemque defluerent.* "Ignorance of the Divine will gives no excuse; because to be ignorant when we may learn, makes us guilty of rejecting knowledge, rather than missing of it: for therefore is salvation far from sinners, because they search not after that which justifies before God, and which indeed is for no other reason preserved in writing, but that it might be derived to the knowledge and understanding of all."

This is a style, and these are maxims, very different from those of the Church of Rome.

4. He affirms that we are to be ignorant of whatsoever the Scripture doth not teach us: and after having asserted, that it is the character of heretics to conceal the holy Scripture, fol. 204, he maintains that it is another mark of heresy to believe beyond what the Gospel teacheth us. *Tu qui ultra Evangelium sapis, necesse est ut aliis alibi arcanorum doctrinis, cognitionem Paterni nominis adeptus sis.* "Thou who art wise beyond the Gospel, it must needs be that thou hast elsewhere, by other secret doctrines, attained the knowledge of God the Father," fol. 132.

5. He asserts, that it was the will of God, that the Scripture should be plain and clear. *Quanta enim potuit Dominus, verborum simplicitate evangelicam fidem locutus est, et in tantum ad intelligentiam nostram sermones aptavit, in quantum naturae nostrae ferret infirmitas, non tamen ut quicquam minus dignum naturae suae majestate loqueretur:* "The Lord hath expressed the faith of the Gospel in the greatest simplicity of words he could, and so far accommodated his speech to our understanding, as the weakness of our nature would bear, yet so as not to speak any thing unbecoming the majesty of his nature."

6. He there also confirms the fullness of Scripture after a most authentic manner: lib. 8. *de Trin.* *Non est humano aut seculi sensu in Dei rebus loquendum;* "In the things of God we are not to speak according to a human or worldly sense and meaning."

And a little after; *Quae scripta sunt legamus, et quae legerimus intelligamus, et tunc perfectae fidei officio fungemur:* "Let us read what is written, and understand what we read, so shall we discharge the duty of perfect faith."

So likewise, lib. 5. p. 46. *Non est de Deo humanis judiciis sentiendum, neque in nobis ea natura est, ut se in coelestem cognitionem suis viribus efferat; a Deo discendum est, quid ex Deo intelligendum sit; quia non nisi se authore cognoscitur*: "We must not think of God according to human judgment; for neither is our nature such, to be able to raise itself by its own strength to heavenly knowledge; we must learn of God whatsoever is to be understood of him, because he is not to be known any further than as he is the author of our knowledge."

And a little after; *Loquendum ergo non aliter de Deo est, quam ut ipse ad intelligentiam nostram de se locutus est*: "Wherefore we are no otherwise to speak of God, than as he, in compliance with our understanding, hath spoke to us concerning himself."

7. He owns no other foundation of the Church besides the confession of the divinity of our Savior, made by St. Peter, instead of referring it to the person of St. Peter, or to the functions of his apostleship; lib. 2. *Unum igitur hoc est immobile fundamentum, una haec est foelix fidei petra, Petri ore confessa, Tu es Filius Dei vivi*; "This is the only immoveable foundation, this is the only happy rock of faith confessed by the mouth of Peter, Thou art the Son of the living God."

8. And so likewise, lib. 6. p. 77. *Super hanc igitur confessionis petram Ecclesiae aedificatio est*: "Wherefore upon the rock of this confession the Church is built."

9. He overthrows all the exceptions of the Church of Rome in favor of the adoration of angels, by maintaining that the angel who appeared to Abraham was Jesus Christ; de Trin. lib. 4. et lib. de Synodis contra Arianos.

10. He was so little of the belief, that the faith of the people depends upon that of their Pastors, that he asserts and proves, in his book against the Arians or Auxentius, that the people may continue orthodox under heretical Pastors.

11. He overthrows all worshipping of creatures, which is practiced by the Church of Rome, by maintaining, that if any should worship Jesus Christ, believing him to be a creature, he would be accursed, lib. 12. de Trinit.

12. He dreamed so little of the infallibility of the Pope, which a great part of the Church of Rome owns as the greatest article, into which the faith of all Christians must be resolved, that he pronounces many anathemas against Liberius, because he had subscribed to an Arian confession of faith; as may be seen in the Fragments of St. Hilary, published by Pithaeus.

13. He lays it down for a maxim, that Jesus Christ alone was without sin, in his discourse upon Psalm 58 and 138.

14. He owns God only to have the power of forgiving sins, Can. 8. in Matth.; so far was he from attributing this power to Ministers, as the Church of Rome doth at this day.

15. He formally asserts that the good works of one man are of no avail to deliver another from punishment, which overthrows the great foundation of satisfactions and purgatory, after the manner that the Church of Rome makes use of them, Can. 27. in Matthew The wise virgins tell the foolish, that they cannot give to them of their oil; *Quia non sit forte quod omnibus satis sit, alienis scilicet operibus et meritis neminem adjuvandum, quia unicuique lampadi suae emere oleum sit necesse*: "Lest perhaps there might not be enough for them all; to intimate that nobody can be helped by the works and merits of another, because it is necessary for every one to buy oil for his own lamp."

16. He was so far from believing the merit of works, as the Church of Rome at present doth, that he discourseth thus upon Psalm 118. lit. *Coph. In operibus quidem bonitatis totus perfectus est, sed satis esse hoc sibi non putat ad salutem, nisi secundum miserationem Dei et judicia, miserationem*

consequatur: "He is indeed wholly perfect in all the works of goodness, but he doth not think this sufficient for his salvation, except according to the mercy of God and his judgments he obtain mercy."

And it is the same notion he gives us, speaking of the parable of the laborers, upon Psalm 130. *Mercedem non operis sed misericordiae undecimae horae operarii consequuntur*.

17. We cannot deny but that St. Hilary believed a purgatory, but yet in that point he differed much from the Church of Rome; he owns a baptism of fire after this life, but such a baptism as was to be conferred at the last day, viz. the day of judgment, Matthew Can. 2. And that which must needs greatly scandalize the Papists is, that St. Hilary maintains that all believers, without excepting so much as the blessed Virgin, must endure the fire, which he expressly affirms on Psalm 118.

18. If we have a mind to know whether he allowed the notion of the Church of Rome, which believes that we can perfectly fulfill the Law of God, we may easily be resolved by his manner of treating the young man, who boasted himself before Jesus Christ, as if he had done it: he accuses him of insolence, in several places of his works, for pretending to be justified by his works. De Trinit. lib. 9. Can. 19. in Matthew et lib. de Patris et Filii unitate.

19. He overturns the common notion of the Church of Rome, which is, that when Jesus Christ entered in to his disciples, the doors being shut, he had not lost the solidity of his body, and consequently that there was a penetration of dimensions: St. Hilary rejects this notion as absurd, accounting this penetration of dimensions impossible, lib. 3. de Trinit.

20. He asserts that the Eucharist is celebrated in breaking of bread, and that the disciples of Jesus Christ did drink of the fruit of the vine at the Lord's Supper, and mentions not so much as one word of transubstantiation, in a place where he particularly explains the institution of the Eucharist, Can. 30. in Matthew To speak the truth, how could he have any other thoughts, who maintains that Jesus Christ is no longer on the earth, in respect of his body, because it is impossible for a body to be in more places than one? *Adest enim et cum fideliter invocatur per naturam suam praesens est; spiritus enim est omnia penetrans et continens; non enim secundum nos corporalis est, ut cum alicubi adsit, absit aliunde, sed virtute praesenti, et se quacunq; est porrigenti, cum replente omnia ejus spiritu in omnibus sit, tamen ei, qui in eum credat, adsistit*: "For he is present by his nature, when he is called upon with faith, he being a spirit penetrating and containing all things: for he is not like us, corporeal, so as that when he is in one place he should be absent from another, but he is in all places by the presence of his power, which extendeth itself wherever he is, and his Spirit that filleth all things; yet he is in a more peculiar manner with him that believes in him."

21. He was so far from approving the Romish inquisition, that he calls the Emperor Constantius Antichrist, for persecuting those that were not of his opinion, lib. in Constant. August. Yea, he judged all force to be so contrary to the spirit of the Christian religion, that he maintains that there can be no religion where force is made use of.

Lastly, He was so far from believing that the Antichrist, whereof St. John speaks, was already come, that he maintains that he would be revealed in the Churches that were then possessed by the Arians, and that the faith being thus attacked, the true believers would be forced to look out for shelter amongst the mountains in woods and caves, leaving the Antichrist master of the public places consecrated to the worship of God.

This is the sum of what may be gathered from the writings of St. Hilary. I make no mention of some errors of this great man, because Claudianus Mamertus, having confuted them about the end of the fifth century, has made it appear that they were only some particular opinions of this great Confessor; and that we cannot look upon them as the common faith of the diocese where he was settled. But the same cannot be said of the articles I have noted; Claudianus is so far from blaming them, that he approves them by his silence, and shews that his doctrine, in this respect, was the doctrine of the Church of Gaul.

We have nothing left us of the works of Rhodanius, Bishop of Toulouse, who was contemporary with St. Hilary: but it appears clear to us, that this holy Confessor having been sent into banishment with St.

Hilary, after the Council of Beziers, by the cabal of Saturninus, Bishop of Arles, favourer of the Arians, we are to consider Rhodanius as a defender of the same faith, and an illustrious witness of the belief of his diocese: and we ought to make the same judgment of Phaebadius, Bishop of Agen, who was so much engaged in the same quarrel, and who acquired so great a name by the vigorous opposition he made against the errors of Arius: but Providence has preserved us one of his books.

In effect, this great man, who wrote in the year 357, as appears by his book against the Arians, gives us sufficiently to understand what his faith was in divers articles, and what was the doctrine of the diocese. 1. He maintains that the Catholic faith is found with those who speak according to the holy Scripture, and not amongst those who only make use of prejudices. After having quoted several places of Scripture, to prove against the Arians the eternity of the Son, he concludes in this manner, B. Patr. t. 4. p. 174. *Volentes igitur a Patre Filium scindere, et infra Deum ponere, de Evangelio praescribunt*: "Those therefore who would rend the Father from the Son, and place him below God, give law to the Gospel."

He expresseth himself yet more strongly to this purpose towards the end of his book, ib. p. 180. *Hoc credimus, hoc tenemus, quia hoc accepimus a Prophetis; hoc nobis Evangelia locuta sunt, hoc Apostoli tradiderunt, hoc Martyres in passione confessi sunt; in hoc mentibus fidei etiam haeremus, contra quod si angelus de coelo annuntiaverit, anathema sit. - Ergo, ut supra diximus, praejudicatae opinionis autoritas nihil valebit, quia contra semetipsam ipsa consistit*: "This we believe, this we hold fast, because it is this we have received from the Prophets, this the Gospels have declared to us, this the Apostles have left us, this the Martyrs in their sufferings have confessed, and to this we adhere with our minds by faith, so that if an angel from heaven should preach contrary to this, let him be accursed. - Wherefore, as was said before, the authority of a prejudicate opinion can be of no force, because it stands against itself."

2. He makes it appear that the name of Catholic was not sufficient to be a true Christian, when he represents that Arianism had so far seized the minds of all the world, that it was necessary to espouse the Arian heresy, to procure the name of being Catholics, ib. p. 169. *Sed quia aut haeresis suscipienda est ut Catholici dicamur, aut vere Catholici non futuri; si haeresin non repudiamus, ad hanc tractatus conditionem necessitate descendimus*: "But because we are either to become heretics, that we may be called Catholics, or cease to be Catholics indeed; by becoming heretics we are necessitated to write this treatise."

3. He asserts that the revelation of holy Scripture is so perfect, with respect to the divinity of our Saviour, that anathemas are to be pronounced against all those that advance any other doctrine. This appears from the great number of passages which he quotes from thence, p. 173 and 178, to which he joins the anathema, whereof I have already spoke before.

4. He observes expressly, that the same honors rendered to Jesus Christ in the Liturgy, as to God, do demonstrate his equality with God, p. 174. *Quod si ita est, saith he, quotidie blasphemamus in gratiarum actionibus et oblationibus sacrificiorum, communia haec Patri et Filio confitentes*, etc. "If it be so, we blaspheme daily in our thanksgivings and offerings of sacrifice, in confessing these things common to Father and Son."

Thus doth he implicitly overthrow the first principles of the Church of Rome, viz. the imperfection of the holy Scripture in matters of faith, the authority and necessity of traditions, which are the completing of it, and other such like doctrines. We should now proceed to examine what the state of these dioceses was in the following century, but that the Bishop of Meaux stops us, to reflect upon the history and doctrine of Vigilantius, whose name is too famous, and his memory too unworthily torn by that Bishop, not to afford him that defense which his zeal against superstition doth justly deserve.

CHAPTER 4

An examination of the opinions of Vigilantius.

Vigilantius was born in Aquitain, as is proved by De Marca, in a dissertation of his which is not yet published, and Priest in the diocese of Barcelona; he had contracted a particular friendship with St. Paulinus, who was ordained Priest at Barcelona; St. Paulinus recommended him in particular to St. Jerome, as he passed through Campania, where St. Paulinus was Bishop, in his way to Jerusalem; St. Jerome received him with all the affection possible, in the year 394, and calls him the holy Priest Vigilantius, in his thirteenth epistle to St. Paulinus. He made no long stay in the Holy Land; it is probable that the disputes about Origenism, which troubled that province, obliged him, to return the sooner. St. Jerome seems to insinuate that Vigilantius had been gained by Rufinus, enemy to St. Jerome, and that after Vigilantius was come into Egypt, and in some other provinces, he accused St. Jerome for having too great a liking for the writings of Origen, etc. decrying him every where as an Origenist. This was the true cause of the hate and rage of St. Jerome against Vigilantius, whereof we have a very sensible instance in his seventy-fifth epistle, which he wrote against Vigilantius about the year 397, where he treats him with the greatest indignity. Vigilantius being returned into Gaul, seems to have made his abode there, and to have published a certain treatise, about the year 406, against the worshipping of relics, which about sixty years before was introduced into the Church. St. Jerome being informed hereof, had an occasion offered him of defending the superstition of the common people against the censures of Vigilantius, and of unloading against him the most injurious language that hatred could inspire.

The writers of the Church of Rome have not been wanting long since to draw their advantage from these invectives of St. Jerome against the Protestants, and never speak of Vigilantius but as a heretic. The Bishop of Meaux hath carefully traced their steps; he tells us therefore, after his manner, very confidently, that even in the fourth century, the most clearsighted of all the rest, there was found but one only, Vigilantius, who opposed himself against the honors given to the saints, and the worshipping of their relics; yet he is looked upon, by the Protestants, as the person who has preserved the depositum, that is to say, the succession of the apostolical doctrine, and is preferred by them to St. Jerome, who hath the whole Church for him.

This of necessity obligeth us to take a particular view of the opinions of Vigilantius. I shall not make a stop to invalidate what the Bishop saith, that Vigilantius wrote in the fourth century, nor at his endeavoring to cloak the notion of his Church concerning the religious worship they give to saints and to relics, under the indeterminate expression of the honors of saints, and the worship of relics: but to come to the thing itself, I maintain, that if Vigilantius had the misfortune of falling under the displeasure of St. Jerome, by the censure he pronounced against the popular superstition of rendering various honors to the relics of saints, yet was he never condemned by the Church that then was, nor treated as an heretic.

Gennadius owns that Vigilantius had an elegant style, and that his zeal for religion had engaged him to write. I own that he charges him with a mistake in his explication of the second vision of Daniel, and in some other articles for which he reckoneth him amongst heretics. But we are to take notice,

1st. That Gennadius wrote an hundred years after Vigilantius, and so follows the judgment St. Jerome had given before of him.

2dly. That he calls these articles heretical, after the manner of ancient authors, who very frankly bestowed the name of heresy on every thing that displeased them, though it had never been condemned by the Scripture, nor rejected by the body of the Church.

3dly. That he looked upon these pretended heresies as of very small importance, because he speaks of an absurd explication of the second vision of Daniel, which St. Jerome had revived, as of an error more considerable than those of Vigilantius, which he does not express, and mentions them as trifles.

However, be it as it will, if the Bishop of Meaux maintains these two things;

1st. That Vigilantius was the only man that opposed the honors of the saints, and the worship of relics; and

2dly. That St. Jerome had the whole Church on his side in his answer; I maintain, against the Bishop, that either he is deceived himself, or was willing to deceive his reader, in both these things.

The falsity of the first will appear to every one that can read. St. Jerome's book against Vigilantius: St. Jerome himself witnesseth, that the holy Bishop, in whose diocese Vigilantius was a Priest, that is to say, the Bishop of Barcelona, was of Vigilantius's opinion; so that we have already discovered one Bishop, whom St. Jerome endeavored to conceal from us; but we shall find a greater number whom St. Jerome himself owns to have approved Vigilantius's opinion, lest we should imagine that Vigilantius and his Bishop were schismatics: "O horrible!" saith St. Jerome, "some Bishops also are said to be partakers of his crimes:" and we may judge of St. Jerome's moderation by that which follows; *Si tamen Episcopi nominandi sunt, qui non ordinant Diaconos nisi primo uxores duxerint, nulli caelibis credentes pudicitiam*: "If we may call them Bishops, who ordain none to be Deacons except they be married, not trusting the chastity of any unmarried person."

What then, shall we conclude that so many Churches, whose Bishops and Priests were all married, had no lawful Bishops or Priests? Can any thing be conceived more extravagant than this? To this acknowledgment of St. Jerome we may add what he saith himself on the sixty-fifth chapter of Isaiah; for he owns that Vigilantius's blaming of that popular superstition had induced divers persons in Gaul to abstain from frequenting the churches of the martyrs, and to withdraw themselves from the prayers that were made there. The falsity of the second article will be no less evident, if we examine the manner of St. Jerome's defending himself against Vigilantius; for though he had undertaken to run down Vigilantius, yet after all he agrees with him in the main.

St. Jerome owns in his fifty-third epistle, which he writes to Riparius, that Vigilantius had writ twice against the worship of relics, and that he called those that adored them, Cinerarii and idolaters, *qui mortuorum hominum ossa venerarentur*, who did honor the bones of dead men; for which St. Jerome calls him a Samaritan and a Jew, because he counted dead bodies to be unclean, as if Christians still lived under the Law.

Whereas Vigilantius blamed the custom of honouring them in the churches, because it was a piece of superstition in a place dedicated to religious worship, to bestow any veneration upon creatures, though the most holy and most excellent that might be. St. Jerome is forced to prevaricate upon this charge; his way of defending this matter is such as would never please the palate of the Church of Rome. *Nos autem non dico martyrum reliquias, sed ne solem quidem et lunam, non angelos, non archangelos, non cherubin, non seraphim, et omne nomen quod nominatur, et in praesenti saeculo et in futuro, colimus et adoramus ne serviamus creaturae potius quam Creatori, qui est benedictus in saecula. Honoramus autem reliquias martyrum, ut eum cujus sunt martyres adoremus; honoramus servos, ut honor servorum redundet ad Dominum, qui ait, Qui vos suscipit, me suscipit. Ergo Petri et Pauli immundae sunt reliquiae, ergo Moysi corpusculum immundum erit, quod, juxta Hebraicam veritatem, ab ipso sepultum est Domino; et quotiescunque Apostolorum et Prophetarum, et omnium martyrum basilicas ingredimur, toties idolorum templa veneramur, accensique ante tumulos eorum cerei idololatriae insignia sunt.*

"But we neither worship nor adore, I do not say the relics of martyrs, but not so much as the sun and moon, etc. nor any name that is named in this world, or in that which is to come, lest we should serve the creature rather than God, who is blessed for ever: but we honor the relics of the martyrs, in worshipping him whose they are; we honor the servants, that their honor may redound to the Lord, who saith, He that receives you, receives me. What! are the relics then of Peter and Paul unclean? Is the body of Moses unclean, which according to the Hebrew truth was buried by the Lord himself? And as often as we enter the churches of the Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs, do we worship the temples of idols? And shall we say that the tapers which burn before their monuments are the marks of idolatry?"

What a fine application doth St. Jerome make here of that passage, He that receives you, receives me; and how solid an answer doth he return to a solid objection, when he tells us, "We honor the servants in worshipping him whose they are."

What a consequence is this! Is there any other honor due to relics, besides that of being interred? Was not this the custom used to the Christians of old, before the time of Constantius? It is well enough seen, that the good Father skips over the difficulty, and under a general protestation of worshipping nothing but God, he endeavors to shelter a custom which had been introduced after the Emperor Constantius's time, that is to say, about sixty years before. Vigilantius blamed the custom, which but a little before had been introduced, of lighting tapers before the tombs of martyrs, and passing the night by them in prayer, wherein he followed the maxims of the Council of Elvira, held under the empire of Constantine, about ninety years before. After what manner doth St. Jerome refute these complaints of Vigilantius? He tells us of the presence of the angels at the grave of Jesus Christ; he relies upon the example of the Apostles, who buried the body of St. Stephen; he produceth the custom of Daniel and the Apostles, who spent the night in prayer; and all this without doubt extremely to the purpose; and the Protestants are much in the wrong to prefer the opinions of Vigilantius to such solid reasonings as these.

But it may be replied, that St. Jerome disputed only slightly, and for argument's sake, in his Epistle to Riparius, not having then seen the writing of Vigilantius, and therefore handled the matter only as a declaimer. This indeed is the best excuse that can be alleged, to make the reader digest the furious transports and invectives of this famous Monk, who treats Vigilantius no otherwise than as another Julian the Apostate, and seems very willing to have had him destroyed by the law mentioned in the thirteenth of Deuteronomy. And after all this, St. Jerome is the same in his book against Vigilantius, which follows this epistle.

After a preface which outdoes all the monsters that either the Scripture or fables speak of, he begins thus; *Exortus est subito Vigilantius, seu verius Dormitantius, qui immundo spiritu pugnet contra Christi Spiritum, et martyrum neget sepulcra veneranda, damnandas dicat esse vigilias, nunquam nisi in Pascha alleluia cantandum, continentiam haeresin, pudicitiam libidinis seminarium; et quomodo Euphorbus in Pythagora renatus esse perhibetur, sic in isto Joviniani mens prava surrexit, ut in illo, et in hoc Diaboli respondere cogamur insidiis*: "Here is suddenly started up one Vigilantius, or rather Dormitantius, who with an unclean spirit fights against the Spirit of Christ, and denies that any veneration ought to be given to the sepulchres of martyrs, condemns the watchings at them, affirms that alleluias ought to be sung at no time except Easter, calls continence heresy, and chastity the nursery of lust; so that as Euphorbus was said to be born again in Pythagoras, in like manner in him seems to be revived Jovinianus's wickedness, in whom as we were forced to oppose ourselves against the wiles of the Devil, so likewise are we now equally obliged to oppose this man's errors."

What Ciceronian eloquence is this! What a strange account of things is here!

But there is something worse behind: see what stories he tells of Jovinian; *Ecclesiae auctoritate damnatus inter Phasides aves et carnes suillas, non tam emisit spiritum, quam eructavit, iste caupo Callaguritanus, et in perversum propter nomen viculi, mutus Quintilianus: miscet aquam vino, et de pristino artificio, suae venena perfidiae Catholicae fidei sociare conatur, impugnare virginitatem, odisse pudicitiam, in convivio saecularium contra sanctorum azemia proclamare, dum inter phialas philosophatur, et ad placentas liguriens, Psalmorum modulatione mulcetur, ut tantum inter epulas David et Idithum et Asaph et filiorum Core cantica audire dignetur*. Surely the good St. Jerome did not think of what he said, so extremely was he transported with an inconsiderate zeal for celibacy; but however, this zeal of his had a reasonable motive: *Proh nefas!* said he. This is the first heresy of Vigilantius; he would have it allowed to Ministers to marry, whereas in the ten provinces subject to the Pope, in the seventeen provinces of the jurisdiction of Ephesus, and in the five provinces of Egypt, they followed a contrary custom.

This without doubt was a crying heresy, and yet it appears from the Decretal of Pope - - to Hymerius, Bishop of Tarracona, that it had made so little impression upon the minds of men, that Innocent I. was fain to write, A.D. 405, to Exuperius, Bishop of Toulouse, upon the same subject of the celibacy of the Clergy; so much opposition did that business every where meet with at that time. We must consider further the

manner how St. Jerome applies the passage, which only regards adultery, to the celibacy of the Clergy: but this is only by way of preface.

St. Jerome tells us at first, that he had received Vigilantius's book by the care of Riparius and Desiderius, who lived near the countries that Vigilantius had infected with his opinions; and that he had been informed by them, that there were some there who favored his vices, and were pleased with his blasphemies: after having branded his book for a stupid piece of ignorance, and which did not deserve to be discussed, were it not for the sake of some silly women, laden with sins, of whom St. Paul speaks, 2 Timothy 3:6, he assaults Vigilantius upon the account of the place of his birth; he was born at Calaguri, whereupon St. Jerome makes a learned disquisition into the original of that people from Pompey's time: Nimirum, saith he, *respondet generi suo, ut qui de latronum et convenarum natus est semine, quos Cn. Pompeius, edomita Hispania, et ad triumphum redire festinans, de Pyrenaei jugis deposuit, et in unum oppidum congregavit, unde et convenarum urbs nomen accepit, hucusque latrocinetur contra Ecclesiam; et de Vectonibus, Arrebacis, Celtiberisque descendens, incurset Galliarum Ecclesias, portetque nequaquam vexillum Christi, sed insigne Diaboli. Fecit hoc idem Pompeius etiam in orientis partibus, ut Cilicibus et Isauris piratis latronibusque superatis, sui nominis inter Ciliciam et Isauriam conderet civitatem. Sed haec urbs hodie servat scita majorum, et nullus in ea ortus est Dormitantius: Galliae vernaculum hostem sustinent, et hominem moti capitis, atque Hippocraticis vinculis alligandum, sedentem sinunt in Ecclesia, et inter caetera verba blasphemiae, etc.*

"He indeed," saith he, "every way answers his extraction; for being descended from robbers, and a mixed rabble drawn together from several parts, whom Pompey, after he had conquered Spain, and hasting to his triumph, removed from the tops of the Pyrenean hills, and gathered them into one city, which therefore was called the City of Strangers: what wonder is it then, if, being such a one, he ravage and spoil the Church; and if, deriving his pedigree from the Vectones, Arrebaci, and Celtiberi, he make incursions upon the Gallic Churches, fighting not under Christ's, but the Devil's banner? Pompey also did the same in the east; where, after he had overcome the pirates and robbers of Cilicia and Isauria, he built a city bearing his own name between Cilicia and Isauria: but to this day that city observes their forefathers' customs, and never produced any Dormitantius; whereas Gaul maintains an home-bred enemy, and suffers a man that is half mad, one fit to be bound in Hippocrates's bands, to sit in the church, etc."

Here is a violent transport of rage: what horrid thing then is it that this robber hath attempted? Why he said, *Quid necesse est to tanto honore non solum honorare, sed etiam adorare illud nescio quid, quod in modico vasculo transferendo colis? Et rursum in eodem libro; Quid pulverem linteamine circumdatum adorando oscularis? Et in consequentibus, Prope ritum Gentilium videmus sub praetextu religionis introductum in ecclesias; sole adhuc fulgente, moles cereorum accendi, et ubicunque pulvisculum nescio quod, in modico vasculo, pretioso linteamine circumdatum osculantes adorare. Magnum honorem praebent hujusmodi homines beatissimis martyribus, quos putant de vilissimis cereolis illustrandos, quos Agnus qui est in medio throni cum omni fulgore majestatis suae illustrat:*

"What need is there for thee not only to venerate, but also adore something I know not what which thou worshipping, carrying it about in a little box? And again in the same book; Why dost thou kiss by way of worship a little dust wrapped up in linen? And afterwards; We have almost seen a heathenish rite introduced into the churches; whole heaps of wax tapers lighted in the face of the sun, and men every where kissing a little dust, shut up in a small box, with religious reverence, which is wrapt about with fine linen. These men must need render a great honor to the most blessed martyrs, whom they suppose to stand in need of the illustration of vile candles, whereas the Lamb that is in the midst of the throne doth illuminate them with all the brightness of his majesty."

This is a dreadful crime in Vigilantius beyond all controversy.

Who is there, replies St. Jerome to this, that ever adored the martyrs? And he proves that it may not be done, by the example of Paul and Barnabas, and of St. Peter. The Church of Rome, and the Bishop of Meaux, are concerned to inquire whether St. Jerome was very orthodox, in denying a thing which at present cannot be so absolutely denied, without the imputation of heresy. After St. Jerome has shewn his indignation against this expression, *illud nescio quid*, as if Vigilantius therein had spoke blasphemy, and derogated from the honor due to the martyrs, he defends his judgment by the examples of Constantine, that

is to say, of Constantius, who had transported to Constantinople the relics of St. Andrew, St. Luke, and Timothy; and of the Emperor Arcadius, who had caused the bones of the Prophet Samuel to be brought out of Judea to Thrace, with the approbation of the Bishops and people of that time. This is a very solid defense, if we may believe St. Jerome; for it seems there is no more to be said, when once a superstition comes to be sixty years old. But the pleasantest thing of all is, that St. Jerome goes about to support this popular worship by this curious way of arguing, *Mortuum suspicaris, et idcirco blasphemus; lege Evangelium, Deus Abraham, Deus Isaac, Deus Jacob; non est Deus mortuorum, sed vivorum. Si ergo vivunt, honesto juxta te carcere non clauduntur; ais enim vel in sinu Abraham, vel in loco refrigerii, vel subter aram Dei, animas Apostolorum et Martyrum consedis, nec posse suis tumultibus et ubi voluerint adesse praesentes; senatoriae videlicet dignitatis sunt, ut non inter homicidas teterrimo carcere, sed in libera honestaque custodia in Fortunatarum Insulis et in Campis Elysiis recludantur. Tu Deo leges ponis, tu Apostolis vincula injicis, ut usque ad diem judicii teneantur custodia; nec sint cum Domino suo, de quibus scriptum est, Sequuntur Agnum quocunque vadit. Si Agnus ubique, ergo et hi qui cum Agno sunt, ubique esse credendi sunt. Et cum Diabolus et daemones toto vagentur orbe, et celeritate nimia ubique praesentes sint, martyres post effusionem sanguinis, sui arca operientur inclusi, et inde exire non poterunt?*

"Thou supposest him to be dead, and therefore thou blasphemest; read the Gospel, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; he is not the God of the dead, but of the living. But if they be alive, say you, they ought not to be shut up in such narrow prisons; and you own that the souls of the Apostles and Martyrs have taken up their abode either in the bosom of Abraham, or in a place of refreshment, or under the altar of God, and they cannot be present at their tombs, or wherever they please: for by your account, they are persons of the first quality, and so ought not to be shut up amongst murderers in a filthy dungeon, but to enjoy a free and honorable custody in the Fortunate Islands and the Elysian Fields. Thus you limit and set laws to God, and bind the Apostles in chains, and keep them in custody till the day of judgment; so that they cannot be with their Lord, of whom it is written, that they follow the Lamb whithersoever he goes. Now seeing the Lamb is every where, they who are with the Lamb must be supposed to be every where also; and when the Devil and spirits do wander throughout the whole world, and by their overgreat nimbleness are present every where, shall we say that the martyrs, after the shedding of their blood, are shut up in their coffins, without being able to stir from thence?"

These fine reasonings of St. Jerome against Vigilantius have two characters. The first is, that they are contrary to the sentiments of most of the ancients: the second is, that they have been despised by St. Austin, and, in fine, have displeased all the Schoolmen; so that it is not worth while to contradict them. St. Jerome handles the rest of his matter much at the same rate. *Dicis in libello tuo, quod dum vivimus mutui pro nobis orare possumus; postquam autem mortui fuerimus, nullius sit pro alio exaudienda oratio: praesertim cum martyres ultionem sui obsecrantes impetrare non quiverint:* "You say in your book, that whilst we are alive we may mutually pray for one another, but that after we are once dead, no man's prayer can be heard for another; and the rather, because even the martyrs themselves begging of God that he would avenge their blood, have not been able to obtain their request."

What is it St. Jerome answers to this? He saith, that if the saints, when alive, procured favors for others, they may obtain them much rather now, when they are with Christ, seeing they are not dead, but asleep, as the Scripture tells us.

As to the wax tapers, the use of which is blamed by Vigilantius, St. Jerome tells us something that will not over well agree with the Church of Rome. *Cereos autem non clara luce accendimus, sicut frustra calumniaris, sed ut noctis tenebras hoc solatio temperemus, et vigilemus ad lumen, ne tecum dormiamus in tenebris. Quod si aliqui propter imperitiam et simplicitatem saecularium hominum, vel certe religiosarum feminarum, de quibus vere possumus dicere, confiteor zelum Dei habent, sed non secundum scientiam, hoc pro honore martyrum faciunt, quid inde perdis? Causabantur quondam et Apostoli quod periret unguentum, sed Domini voce correpti sunt; neque enim Christus indigebat unguento, nec martyres lumine cereorum; et tamen illa mulier in honore Christi hoc fecit, devotioque mentis ejus recipitur: et quicumque accendunt cereos, secundum fidem, suam habent mercedem, dicente Apostolo, Unusquisque suo sensu abundet:*

"Neither do we light wax tapers at noonday, as you causelessly complain, but only to allay the darkness of the night with the help of candles, and to be kept waking by the light of them, lest being in darkness we should fall asleep as well as you. But and if some out of ignorance and simplicity amongst the laymen or devout women, of whom we may truly say, that they have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge, should do this in honor to the martyrs, what is the loss or hurt of all this? So the Apostles also murmured of old, that the woman made waste of her ointment, but were reprov'd by our Lord himself; neither did the Lord want the ointment, any more than the martyrs stand in need of wax tapers; and yet because the woman did it in honor to Christ, her devotion is accepted of; and so they who light wax tapers receive a reward according to their faith; for the Apostle tells us, Let every one abound in his own sense."

One cannot avoid taking notice how St. Jerome abuseth this passage of St. Paul, and the pretense he gives for adjudging rewards to all sorts of superstition; however we must acknowledge, that in this article St. Jerome hath many more approvers than Vigilantius.

Vigilantius called them idolaters, who, by lighting wax tapers by daylight, did imitate the customs of the heathens. How does St. Jerome answer him? First, He tells him, that what was done of this kind to idols was detestable; but that the same thing, when done out of respect to the martyrs, is very commendable. Secondly, That the eastern Churches lighted candles at the reading of the Gospel, though there be no relics of the martyrs. Thirdly, That Jesus Christ assigns to the wise virgins lamps lighted. Fourthly, He opposeth to Vigilantius the example of the Bishop of Rome, who celebrated the Mass upon the tombs of the Apostles, as upon an altar. I feared I should tire the patience of my reader, should I go about to examine this piece of St. Jerome's throughout: this specimen may suffice to judge of the whole work.

I shall therefore only reduce to some few articles what I have further to add, in order to the full clearing of this question.

1. I affirm, that the Bishop of Meaux had no reason to say that Vigilantius opposed himself against the honors done to saints. St. Jerome does not accuse him of it in any part of his works; he only blames him because he was not for giving them so great honor as other men did. *Quid necesse est tanto honore, non tantum honorare, sed etiam adorare illud nescio quid?* "What necessity is there not only to honor, but even to adore and worship I know not what, with so very great honor?"

2. It is for the Bishop of Meaux to tell us, whether he believes with St. Jerome, that Vigilantius was an heretic for denying that the souls of saints are present at their graves; and whether St. Jerome doth solidly prove, that we ought to believe them to be every where, where Jesus Christ is, because it is said in the Revelations, that the virgins follow the Lamb whithersoever he goes.

3. The truth is, Vigilantius stretched the point too far, in maintaining, that, after we are dead, the prayer of any one for another cannot be heard. Probably also he might be too rigid, in refusing to enter into the churches of the Apostles and Martyrs, to signify his aversion to the superstition which then began to be introduced, as St. Austin complains, *De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae*, cap. 34. p. 37.

1. But it is false, that because Vigilantius found fault with the adoration of relics, therefore St. Jerome maintained the same to be lawful: he was so far from that, that he upbraids Vigilantius with calumniating the Church by this his accusation. *Quis, O insanum caput! aliquando martyres adoravit? Quis hominem putavit Deum?* "Who ever, O foolish man, adored the martyrs? Who ever took a man to be God?"

It is evident that St. Jerome takes adoration to be an act due to God alone, and which he does not divide in two sorts, as the Church of Rome does at this day, which indeed makes three different sorts of it.

2. It is false, that St. Jerome maintains that the Church prayed to saints, whereof Vigilantius accuseth those against whom he had writ. He agrees with Vigilantius, that the saints ought not to be prayed to even as friends to Christ, and intercessors with God; *ne ut amici quidem Dei et comprecatores ad Deum*. Is it not manifest that the Bishop of Meaux abuses the world, when he quotes St. Jerome in favor of the Church of Rome, which prays to saints on both these accounts, which are so expressly rejected by St. Jerome; and when he upbraids the Protestants for following of Vigilantius in an article which St. Jerome owns as well

as he, and the whole Church at that time? But to speak the truth, the whole of Vigilantius's crime consists, first, in that he was willing to bring the discipline of the Council of Elvira in force again, which was assembled at the beginning of the fourth century; the constitutions whereof were undervalued towards the end of the same age, after the Christian religion began to bear down all its opposers, under the reign of Constantine and his children. Secondly, because he attributes to the Church some customs which were not all of them authorized, though they were already generally received and maintained by the ignorant and superstitious sort of people. Thirdly, because he opposed some customs as general, which were capable of being explained in a tolerable sense. But indeed at the bottom, St. Jerome and Vigilantius were very well agreed upon the point we condemn in the Church of Rome; neither do we find that the Church, to which Vigilantius did belong, did ever except against him. Thus it is evident, that the Protestants may look upon Vigilantius as a zealous defender of the Christian purity, and one of those who opposed themselves against superstition in its first rise.

CHAPTER 5

The state of the Churches of Aquitaine and Narbon in the fifth century.

This age furnisheth us with several considerable witnesses. St. Jerome, whom the Bishop of Meaux has endeavored to represent as our antagonist, is the first of them.

He saith, speaking of Exuperius, Bishop of Tholouse, that this holy Bishop carried the Eucharist in a wicker basket, a way by no means agreeable to the custom of the Church of Rome, where it is accompanied with quite different ceremonies. First, because it is made the object of adoration; and that in the very streets. Secondly, because people dare not touch the least crumb of it, as being persuaded that the body of Jesus Christ which is in the host multiplies according to the number of the crumbs into which the host may be broken. Thirdly, because by this means it might come to be trod under foot or lost, upon which a thousand inconveniencies must follow.

It is worth observing here concerning this custom of carrying the Eucharist about, which was in use in the second century, as appears from the writings of Justin Martyr, that it differed very much from what we find in the Romish Church since the twelfth century. For indeed since that time Rome has taken great care to obtain laws whereby all that walk in the streets, whether Jews, Heathens, or Christians, might be compelled to adore what she looks upon as her God. But we find nothing like this in any law of the emperors, or Christian princes in favor of the adoration of the Eucharist.

The second witness whom we may consult about the state of these dioceses is Sulpitius Severus, Monk of Primuliacum in Guienne. And since he wrote at a time when the zeal for that kind of life did transport the best men, we need not wonder that he hath inserted so many fables in the books we have of his, though, setting those aside, nothing was finer in that age than his writings.

But after all, it is certain, that notwithstanding all this leaven of a monastic spirit, we find many characters of a very pure divinity in his books: this will appear from the following observations; whence it is obvious to conclude, that he was not engaged in Popish maxims.

1. He maintains, that it was Jesus Christ that wrestled with Jacob; which passage the Doctors of the Church of Rome corrupt, to have an occasion thence to conclude that a mere angel had blessed Jacob; Pridie, saith he, *quam inter se fratres convenirent, Dominus, humana specie assumpta, colluctatus cum Jacob refertur. Et cum adversus Dominum praevaluisset, tamen non esse mortalem non ignoravit; benedici sibi ab eo flagitabat*: "The day before the brothers met, the Lord is said to have wrestled with Jacob in a human form; and though he prevailed against the Lord, yet he knew him not to be mortal, and desired to be blessed by him."

2. He owns the second Commandment, and distinguisheth it from the first. *Non erunt tibi Dii alieni praeter me. Non facies tibi idolum*. "Thou shalt have no other Gods but me. Thou shalt not make to thyself a graven image."

Neither doth he split the last command into two, as the Church of Rome does at present; for he concludes the decalogue in this manner, *Non falsum testimonium dices adversus proximum tuum. Non concupisces quidquam proximi tui*. "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor. Thou shalt not covet any thing that is thy neighbor's?"

3. He was so little persuaded that the name of Catholic was a solid character of the true Church, that he confesses that Arianism had infected all the world. See how he expresseth himself, *Eoque his certaminibus processum, ut istiusmodi piaculis orbis terrarum implicaretur, nam Italiam, Illyricum atque orientem Valens et Ursacius, caeterique, quorum nomina edidimus, infecerant*: "And these contests proceeded so far,

that the whole world became involved in this wickedness; for Valens and Ursacius, with the rest, whose names we have mentioned, had infected Italy, Illyricum, and the east."

4. He minded the Pope's power of suppressing heresy so little, that he owns St. Hilary to have preserved Gaul: *Illud*, saith he, *apud omnes constitit, unius Hilarii beneficio, Gallias nostras piaculo haeresis liberatas*; "Thus much was known to all, that by the sole endeavors of Hilary, our Gaul was delivered from the infection of heresy."

5. He shews so violent an aversion to the spirit of persecution, that he very sharply reproves Ithacius for using the Priscillianists hardly, who were a branch of the Manichees that had settled themselves in Spain, and for persuading the Emperor Gratian to banish them: Is, saith he, viz. *Ithacius, vero sine modo et ultra quam oportuit, Idacium sociosque ejus lacessens, facem quandam nascenti incendio subdidit, ut exasperaverit malos potius quam compresserit - Tum vero Idacius atque Ithacius acrius instare - arbitantes posse inter initia malum comprimi; sed parum sanis consiliis saeculares judices adeunt, ut eorum decretis atque executionibus, haeretici urbibus pellerentur. Igitur post multa et foeda Idacio supplicante, elicitur a Gratiano tum Imperatore rescriptum*, etc. "But he above measure, and beyond what ought to have been done, provoking Idacius and his fellows, helped to blow the flame, and exasperate these wicked men, rather than suppress them. Whereupon Idacius and Ithacius began to double their endeavors, supposing that the mischief might be suppressed in its beginning; but being ill advised, they address themselves to secular judges, that by their decrees and executions the heretics might be banished the cities. Thus after many and base intrigues upon Idacius's petitioning, an order was drawn from Gratian, the then Emperor," etc.

6. He draws such a parallel between St. Ambrose and Pope Damasus, that he attributes to them the supreme authority in the Church, which doth not at all agree with the notion of Papacy. After having said that it was impossible for the Priscillianists to justify themselves before Damasus, Bishop of Rome, and St. Ambrose, because both these Bishops refused to hear them, he proceeds thus; *Tum vertere consilia, ut quia duobus Episcopis, quorum ea tempestate summa autoritas erat, non illuserat*, etc. "Then they began to change their measures, and because they could not delude the two Bishops, whose authority was supreme at that time," etc.

7. He informs us what the tendency is of the worship given to martyrs, by the history he gives us of an altar, which the popular superstition had rendered famous, because they pretended that some martyrs had been buried in that place. St. Martin, whose life is described by our author, not being able to make any certain discovery of the name of this martyr, and the circumstances of his sufferings, and being loth absolutely to doubt of the truth of it, thought fit himself to go to this famous sepulcher, in company of some of his brethren: being come to the place, he earnestly begged of God to reveal to him the name and merit of the martyr; and afterwards turning himself towards the left, *Vidit prope assistere umbram sordidam truncem*; "He sees standing near him a hideous and terrible ghost."

They command him to declare himself, the ghost obeys; *Nomen edicit, de crimine confitetur, latronem se fuisse, ob scelera percussum, vulgi errore celebratum; sibi nihil cum martyribus esse commune; cum illos gloria, se poena retineret*: "Tells his name, confesseth his crime, that he had been executed for robbery, that it was only the error of the people caused him to be canonized; that he was in nothing like the martyrs, who were in glory, whereas he was in pain."

The good St. Martin being troubled to hear this account, caused the altar to be carried to another place; and so, saith our author, delivered the people from a superstitious error.

8. He declares that the custom of carrying the images of the saints through the parishes, was no better than a custom derived from the heathens. The same saint, saith he, once by accident saw a company of heathens at a distance, who accompanied the body of an heathen to the grave; but finding himself too far off to discover what they were about, and perceiving the winds to wave the linen wherewith the dead body was covered, he imagined they were employed about the profane ceremonies of their sacrifices, and the reason he gives of it is this: *Quia esset haec Gallorum rusticis consuetudo, simulacra daemonum, candido tecta velamine, misera per agros suos circumferre dementia*; "Because it was the custom of the country people of Gaul to carry madly about their grounds the images of demons, covered over with a white veil."

9. He lays down a very remarkable maxim for the Albigenses: *Ecclesiam auro non strui, sed potius destrui*: "That gold was not the means of building, but rather of destroying the Church;" which those of the Church of Rome could never forgive him, as appears by their censures in the margin.

10. He severely blames the conduct of those who employ violence against such as do not acquiesce in their decisions. He went, saith he, to Alexandria, but would not make any stay in a place: *Ubi recens fraternae cladis fervebat invidia; nam etsi fortasse videantur parere Episcopis debuisse, non ob hanc tamen causam multitudinem tantam sub Christi confessione viventem, praesertim ab Episcopis oportuisset affigi*: "Where the reproach of their intestine slaughters was yet fresh; for though perhaps it was their duty to have obeyed the Bishops, yet such a vast number of persons living in the confession of Christ ought not to have been afflicted in that manner, especially by the Bishops."

11. He acquaints us with the unjust proceedings of the Spanish Bishops against the Priscillianists, and the ridiculous marks they had to discover them: *Maximus Imperator, alias satis bonus, depravatus consiliis Sacerdotum, post Priscilliani necem, Ithacium Episcopum Priscilliani accusatorem, caeterosque illius socios, vi regia tuebatur, ne quis ei crimini daret, opera illius cujuscunque modi hominem fuisse damnatum. Et jam pridie Imperator ex illorum sententia decreverat tribunos summa potestate armatos ad Hispanias mittere, qui haereticos inquirerent, deprehensis vitam et bona adimerent: nec dubium erat quin sanctorum etiam maximam turbam tempestas ista depopulatura est, parvo discrimine inter hominum genera: etenim tum solis oculis judicabatur, cum quis pallore potius aut veste, quam fide haereticus aestimaretur*:

"Maximus the Emperor, otherwise a very good man, being spoiled by the counsel of the Priests, after Priscillian's death, did by his kingly power defend Ithacius the Bishop, Priscillian's accuser, and the rest of his associates, that no body might reflect on him, as if by his procurement any man had been condemned. - The day before the Emperor had already, according to their liking, resolved to send tribunes with full power into Spain, to examine those that were heretics, and being found such, to take away their lives and estates: neither was it to be doubted but that this storm would have reached the greatest part of believers, because of the small distinction made between them and the other: for then they judged persons only by the eye, esteeming them heretics from their pale looks or habit, rather than by their faith."

He afterwards shews the horror that St. Martin had conceived against these kind of proceedings. There was nothing he was more concerned about; *Illa praecipua cura ne tribuni cum jure gladium ad Hispanias mitterentur*: "Than to prevent the tribunes being sent into Spain, with the power of the sword."

He renounced communion with these sanguinary bishops; but not long after, to avoid a greater mischief, he was obliged to give up that point, though he still refused to subscribe to the condemnation of the Priscillianists; *Hujus diei communionem Martinus iniit, satius aestimans ad horam cedere, quam his non consulere, quorum cervicibus gladius imminabat; veruntamen summa vi Episcopis nitentibus ut communionem illam subscriptione firmaret, extorqueri non potuit*: "Martin communicated with them at that time, thinking it better for a while to give way to them, than not to provide for their safety, who had the sword hanging over them: but yet though the Bishops used their utmost endeavors to make him ratify his communicating with them by his subscription, they could never bring him to it."

If we consult Vincentius Lirinensis and Cassian, they will afford us much light as to the state of these dioceses.

Vincentius, a priest of the monastery of Lerins, is one of those who can best inform us what was esteemed orthodox in these churches. Indeed we find all the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome are condemned in the maxims that he solidly asserts in the 28th chapter of his *Commonitorium*, where he maintains that the Church may every day make a further progress in the knowledge of truth, and all this without making any innovation: *Crescat igitur oportet, et multum vehementerque proficiat, tam singulorum quam omnium, tam unius hominis quam totius Ecclesiae, aetatum ac saeculorum gradibus intelligentia, scientia, sapientia, sed in suo duntaxat genere, in eodem se dogmate, eodem sensu, eademque sententia*: "The understanding, knowledge, and wisdom, as well of every singular person as of the whole Church, ought to grow and greatly increase, according to the several degrees of times and ages, but every one in his own way; that is to say, in the same doctrine, in the same sense, and the same judgement."

2. He in the same place exclaims against all new doctrines and new names, and yet owns that the Church acquires daily more light in matters of religion; *Sed ita tamen ut vere profectus sit ille, fidei non permutatio*: "But yet so that this is really an advancement, not a change of faith."

3. He reduces all that we ought to believe to the rule of faith, and declares what is the true use and the true authority of the Doctors of the Church: *Quae tamen antiqua sanctorum Patrum consensio, non in omnibus Divinae legis quaestiunculis, sed solum certe praecipue in fidei regula, magno nobis studio et investiganda est et sequenda. Quibus tamen (Patribus) hac lege credendum est, ut quicquid vel omnes vel plures, uno eodemque sensu, manifeste, frequenter, perseveranter, velut quodam consentiente sibi magistrorum consilio, accipiendo, tenendo, tradendo firmaverint, id pro indubitato, certo, ratoque habeatur*: "But yet this primitive consent of the holy Fathers is not to be inquired after and followed as to the lesser questions of Divine law alike, but especially, if not only, in the rule of faith. - Which Fathers we may give full credit to, on this condition, that whatsoever all or the most of them do in the same sense, manifestly, frequently, and constantly maintain, as in a council of masters agreeing together, by their receiving, holding and delivering the same, that ought to be esteemed unquestionable, certain, and firm."

4. He lays down a method how we may dispute with the Church of Rome about the errors she has drawn from antiquity, by reducing the whole dispute to the Scripture: *Atque ideo quascunque illas antiquiores, vel schismatum vel haeresewn profanitates, hullo modo nos oportet, nisi aut sola, si opus est, Scripturarum autoritate convincere, aut certe jam antiquitus universalibus Sacerdotum Catholicorum conciliis convictas damatasque vitare*: "Wherefore we are no other way to convict all ancient errors of schism or heresy, but either, if need be, by the sole authority of Scripture, or else to avoid them, as already condemned by the universal councils of Catholic Priests."

5. He excellently explains the use of tradition, without derogating any thing from the sufficiency of Scripture: *Diximus in superioribus hanc fuisse semper, et esse hodieque Catholicorum consuetudinem, ut fidem veram duobus istis mediis adprobent: primum Divini canonis autoritate; deinde Ecclesiae traditione: non quia canon solus non sibi ad universa sufficiat, sed quia verba Divina pro suo plerique arbitratu interpretantes, varias opiniones erroresque concipiant; atque ideo necesse sit ut ad unam ecclesiastici sensus regulam Scripturae coelestis intelligentia dirigatur; in iis duntaxat praecipue quaestionibus, quibus totius Catholici dogmatis fundamenta nituntur*:

"We have said before, that this hath been and still is the custom of Catholics, to prove the true faith two ways; first, by the authority of the Divine canon; and secondly, by the Church's tradition: not as if the canon were not of itself sufficient, but because most men interpret Scripture according to their own private fancy, which has given occasion to various opinions and errors: wherefore it is needful that the understanding of holy Scripture be regulated by one single determination of the Church, and particularly in those questions on which the foundations of all Catholic doctrine rest." Lastly, he desires that universal consent may be taken only from such a tradition as he authorizeth: *Item diximus in ipsa rursus Ecclesia universitatis pariter ac antiquitatis consensionem spectari oportere, ne aut ab unitatis integritate in partem schismatis abrumpamur, aut a vetustatis religione in haeresewn novitates praecipitemur*: "We have said also that in the Church we are to have an eye to the consent of universality and antiquity, that we be not rent from the entire union into a schism, or be cast headlong from the religion of the ancients into the novelties of heresy."

There needs little more than these maxims to secure a Church where they are taught, from those corruptions into which the Church of Rome is fallen by her continual practice of the contrary, as well in respect of the doctrines of faith, as of religious worship.

Cassian, a Priest, the disciple of Chrysostom, hath writ much concerning the institutes of Monks, and accordingly we find in his writings several instances of their folly and pride. He saith the young Monks observed the rules prescribed to them so exactly, *Ut non solum non audeant, absque Praepositi sui scientia vel permissu, non solum cella progredi, sed ne ipsi quidem communi et naturali necessitati satisfacere sua autoritate praesumant*: "That, without leave obtained from their Abbot, they dare not only not stir out of their cells, but what is more, not so much as satisfy the common necessities of nature."

He shews that covetousness began already to reign amongst the Monks of his time. Tertius, saith he, *nobis est conflictus adversus philargyriam, quam nos amorem pecuniarum possumus appellare; peregrinum bellum et extra naturam, nec aliunde in Monacho sumens principium, quam de corruptae et torpidae mentis ignavia, et plerumque initio abrenuntiationis male arrepto, et erga Deum tepido amore*: "Our third conflict is with the love of money, a foreign and unnatural war, and which arises in Monks from the sluggishness of a corrupt and benumbed mind, and very oft is grounded upon an inconsiderate entrance upon a self-denying life, and a lukewarm love towards God."

He cannot bear the impudence of those covetous Monks who defended themselves with those words of Jesus Christ, It is more glorious to give than to receive. He censures the impertinent interpretation which some Monks put upon these words of Christ, Whosoever doth not take up his cross and follow me, is not worthy of me: *Quod quidam districtissimi Monachorum, habentes quidem zelum Dei, sed non secundum scientiam, simpliciter intelligentes, fecerunt sibi cruces ligneas, easque jugiter humeris circumferentes, non aedificationem, sed risum cunctis videntibus intulerunt*: "Which some of the strictest Monks, having a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge, taking too literally, made themselves wooden crosses, and by carrying them about upon their shoulders, instead of edifying, provoked those that saw them to laughter."

2. He informs us that the monks of Egypt were no scrupulous observers of their fasts, and that they made no difficulty of breaking them, in order to discharge some duty which appeared of more importance to them. Cassian tells us he was surprised at it; but one of the eldest Monks returned him this excellent answer: *Jejunium semper est mecum; vos autem continuo dimissurus, mecum jugiter tenere non potero. Et jejunium quidem, licet utile sit, ac jugiter necessarium, tamen voluntarii muneris est oblatio: opus autem charitatis impleri exigit praecepti necessitas*: "To fast is always in my power; but you being ready to depart, I cannot have you always with me. Besides, to fast, though it be useful and always necessary, yet it is but a free-will-offering: whereas acts of charity are required of us upon the account of their being commanded."

3. It appears that they did not believe the Scriptures to be so obscure as at this day they are supposed to be. We may see what Abbot Theodorus thought of this matter, as we find it set down by Cassian. *Monachum ad Scripturarum notitiam pertingere cupientem, nequaquam debere labores suos erga commentatorum libros impendere, sed potius omnem mentis industriam et intentionem cordis erga emendationem vitiorum camalium detinere, quibus expulsis, confestim cordis oculi, sublato velamine passionum, sacramenta Scripturarum velut natura liter incipient contemplari. Siquidem nobis, non ut essent incognita vel obscura, Sancti Spiritus gratia promulgata sunt: sed nostro vitio, velamine peccatorum cordis oculos obnubente, redduntur obscura, quibus rursus naturali redditis sanitati, ipsa Scripturarum sanctarum lectio ad contemplationem veme scientiae abunde etiam sola sufficiat, nec eos commentatorum institutionibus indigere*:

"That a Monk who desires to attain to the knowledge of Scripture, ought not to spend his time upon commentators, but rather bend and apply his utmost industry and attention to the purging himself from fleshly lusts, which if they are once expelled, then immediately the eyes of the heart, upon removing of the vail of passions, will as it were naturally begin to contemplate the mysteries of Scripture; since we may be sure that the grace of the Holy Spirit never gave them forth that they should continue unknown or obscure; but they are darkened by our own fault, because the vail of sin covers the eyes of the soul, which when once restored to their natural soundness, the very reading of the Holy Scripture is alone abundantly sufficient for their contemplation of true knowledge; neither do they further need the instructions of commentators."

4. It is evident that he did not believe transubstantiation, because he saith, *Nemo in terris situs in coelis esse potest*: "No body placed on the earth can be in heaven."

5. We find that he did not own auricular confession, no more than Chrysostom his master, because where he gives an account of the means whereby we may obtain the forgiveness of sins, he doth not mention one word of it. True it is that he speaks indeed of a confession of sins, but of such an one as is to be made to God alone. *Nec non*, saith he, *per peccatorum confessionem eorum abolitio conceditur; Dixi enim, ait, pronuntiabo adversum me injustitiam meam Domino, et tu remisisti impietatem peccati mei*: "And also by the confession of sin their forgiveness is granted; For, saith he, I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the Lord, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin."

6. He acknowledges that the fast of Lent was no apostolical law. *Sciendum sane hanc observationem Quadragesimae, quamdiu Ecclesiae illius primitivae perfectio illibata permansit, penitus non fuisse. - Verum cum ab illa apostolica devotione descendens quotidie credentium multitudo suis opibus incubaret, nec eas usui cunctorum, secundum Apostolorum instituta divideret; sed privatim impendiis suis consulens, non servare tantum, sed etiam augere contenderet, Ananias et Sapphira exemplum non contenta sectari; id tunc universis Sacerdotibus placuit, ut homines curis saecularibus illigatos, et pene, ut ita dixerim, continentiae vel compunctionis ignaros, ad opus sanctum canonica indictione revocarent.* "We are to know that as long as the perfection of that primitive Church remained untainted, there was no such observation of Lent. - But when the multitude of believers, daily declining from that apostolical devotion, set their hearts upon their riches, not distributing them for the use of all, according to the rule of the Apostles, but applying themselves to private expenses, endeavored not only to keep what they had, but to increase it, being not content to follow the example of Ananias and Sapphira; then was it thought good by the universality of priests, to recal men that were entangled in secular business, and in a manner ignorant of what continence or compunction meant, to this holy work by the canonical injunction of a fast."

I proceed to other considerable authors who have lived in these dioceses. Salvian, a Priest at Marseilles, informs us what their faith was, in several important articles.

1. He refers all faith to the Scriptures: *Si scire vis, saith he, quid tenendum sit, habes Literas sacras: perfecta ratio est hoc tenere quod legeris. - Cum legimus quod regat cuncta quae fecit; hoc ipso approbamus quod regit, quia se regere testatur. Cum legimus quod praesenti judicio omnia dispenset; hoc ipso est evidens quod judicat, quia se judicare confirmat. Alia enim omnia, id est, humana dicta, argumentis ac testibus egent: Dei autem sermo ipse sibi testis est; quia necesse est quicquid incorrupta veritas loquitur incorruptum sit veritatis testimonium:* "Wouldst thou know what thou art to believe; thou hast the holy Scripture; it is the perfection of reason to hold whatever thou readest there. - When we read that he rules every thing that he hath made; by this we approve of his governing of every thing, because he says it. For all other, that is, human sayings, stand in need of proofs and witnesses; but God's word is its own witness; because whatsoever incorrupt truth speaks must needs be an incorrupt witness of truth."

2. He seems to approve of the difficulty which some of the Waldenses and Albigenses made to swear, when he saith, *Jussit Salvator noster, ut Christiani homines non jurarent:* "Our Savior commanded that Christians should not swear."

3. He absolutely forbids pride to those who believe themselves righteous. See how he expresses himself; *Et hoc intolerabilis superbiae atque immanis piaculi crimen est, si tam bonum se aliquis esse credat, ut etiam malos existimet per se posse salvari. Loquens Deus de terra quadam, vel de populo peccatore, sic dicit: Si fuerint tres viri in medio ejus, Noe et Daniel et Job, non liberabunt filios et filias, ipsi soli salvi erunt. Neminem tamen reor tam impudentem fore qui se his talibus viris audeat comparare: quia quamvis placere nunc aliquis Deo studeat, hoc ipsum tamen genus maximum injustitiae est, si se justum praesumat:* "This also is intolerable pride, and the highest wickedness, for any one to think himself so good, as that wicked men may be saved by his means," etc. and concludes; "For though a man may do his endeavor to please God, yet is it the highest kind of unrighteousness, if he presume himself to be righteous."

He passeth the same judgment upon those who believe they merit by their prayer; *Neque enim unquam nos ita vivimus ut exaudiri mereamur:* "Neither do we ever live so as to deserve to have our prayers heard."

4. He gives us a perfect picture of the hypocrisy of the Monks of his time. *Qui, saith he, sub specie religionis, vitiis saecularibus mancipati: qui scilicet post veterum flagitiorum probra et crimina, titulo sanctitatis sibi inscripto, non conversatione aliis, sed professione nomen tantum denotaverunt, non vitam: et summam Divini cultus habitum magis quam actum existimantes, vestem tantummodo exuere, non mentem; nam taliter ferme omnes agunt, ut eos non tam putes antea poenitentiam criminum egisse, quam postea ipsius poenitentiae poenitere: nec tam prius poenituisse quod male vixerint, quam postea quod se promiserint bene esse victuros: Novum prorsus conversionis genus! licita non faciunt, et illicita committunt. Temperant a concubitu, et non temperant a rapina. - Quid agis, stulta persuasio? Peccata interdixit Deus, non matrimonia; non conveniunt studiis vestris facta vestra: non debetis esse amici criminum, qui dicitis vos sectatores esse virtutum:*

"Who under a shew of religion are slaves to the vices of this world; who having taken upon themselves a title of holiness, after the reproaches and scandals of former crimes, do not alter their lives by a new conversation, but change their names by a new profession; and thinking that the sum of the worship of God lies more in their clothes than their actions, they have only changed their garments, not their minds; for they do almost all things in such a manner, that you would not so much think that they had repented of their former crimes, as that afterwards they had repented of their repentance; nor that at first they repented of their wicked lives, so much as afterwards that they had ever promised to live well. - A new kind of conversion this is: what is lawful they do not do, and commit what is unlawful. They abstain from women, but not from rapine."

He adds to his sharp censure of them, that God never forbade marriage: "O foolish persuasion, what dost thou? God forbids sin, not marriage; your actions do not agree with your profession; you must not be friends to crimes, who pretend to be followers of virtues."

He shews also that at Carthage they were extremely despised. "And if at any time any servant of God, from the monasteries of Egypt, or the holy places at Jerusalem, or from the holy and venerable retirements of the wilderness, happened to come to that town to perform some divine office, he was no sooner seen by the people, but they all loaded him with opprobrious language, sacrilege and curses."

5. He shews that it is in vain for any one to bear the name of Catholic, if he doth not answer that character; and he prefers the Goths and Vandals, that were Arians, to the orthodox Christians of his time. "They, saith he, are humble towards God, we rebellious; they believed victory to be in God's hand, we in our own. -- What can the privilege of a religious name avail us, that we call ourselves Catholics, that we boast ourselves to be believers, that we despise the Goths and Vandals, by reviling them as heretics, whilst we ourselves live as ill as heretics? - If we be not found doing these things, (viz. the duties of true Christians,) it is in vain that we flatter ourselves with the empty presumption of the name of Catholics."

6. He sufficiently shews that prayer for the dead was at that time thought to be a very uncertain thing, when he saith, "But if either the violence of the disease be such, or the carelessness of the sick hath been so great, as to continue in their spiritual infection till they are a dying, then I do not know what to say, or what to promise. - It is better in deed to leave nothing unattempted, than to neglect a dying person; especially, because I do not know, whether to endeavor any thing at the last gasp may be a medicine; sure it is, that to try nothing, is certain perdition."

7. He expressly excludes the doctrine of merits. "For this alone what equivalent can man pay, for whom Christ gave himself by the suffering of most extreme pains? Or what will he render to the Lord worthy of him, who owns God himself to be God, by whom he was redeemed?"

I ought in this place to mention a canon of the first Council of Orange, held in the year 441; at which fifteen of the Bishops of Gallia Narbonensis and the country about Lyons assisted. It is the 17th canon; the first words are these, *Cum capsula et calix offerendus est* (other MSS. have *inferendus*, which seems more agreeable to reason) *et admixtione Eucharistiae consecrandus*. We find that this canon does hint at these two things very clearly. First, that at that time they kept the bread of the Eucharist in a casket or coffer, so far were they from making it an object of their adoration. Second, that the mingling only of the bread that was consecrated before, with the wine that was not consecrated, made them look upon the wine, though not consecrated by the words of Jesus Christ, as the blood of Jesus Christ; which is the most extravagant and senseless notion in the world, if we suppose that these Fathers were seasoned with the doctrine of transubstantiation, which attributes to the words of Christ, only the virtue of changing the substance of the wine into the substance of the blood of Christ. Allatius takes a great deal of pains to avoid this argument, which shews, that the Greek Church, that believes the same, cannot be of the faith of the Church of Rome. In the mean time, the thing is certain, and Mabillon has ingenuously acknowledged, that this is the true sense of that canon. And indeed there are many proofs that make it evident, that both the Greek and Latin Fathers were of this opinion.

Salonius, one of the most famous Bishops of Gallia Narbonensis, owns no other doctrine but that of the Old and New Testament. Drink waters out of thine own cistern, and running waters out of thine own well. S. "By cistern he means the catholic doctrine, that is, that of the Old and New Testament; and by the well,

he understands the depth and height of the same catholic doctrine, that is, the various meanings of holy Scripture: for in these words he teacheth us to beware of the doctrine of heretics, and to attend to the reading of holy Scripture."

He will have the author's meaning, and not tradition, to be the explication of Scripture. Do not remove the ancient landmarks, or bounds, which thy fathers have set.

S. "By the ancient bounds he understands the bounds of truth and faith, which catholic Doctors have placed from the beginning."

He would have no man therefore receive the truth of holy faith and gospel doctrine, any otherwise than it hath been handed down to them by the holy Fathers, and likewise commands that no man interpret the words of holy Scripture, otherwise than according to the intention of each writer.

He doth not own the Apocrypha. How many books did Solomon publish?

S. "Three only, according to the number of their titles, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles. V. What doth Solomon say in the Proverbs, or what doth he teach in Ecclesiastes, and his Songs?"

He assigns but two places whither the soul goes immediately.

"For, by the tree, man is understood, because every man is as it were a tree in the wood of mankind; by the south, which is a warm wind, is signified the rest of paradise; and by the north, which is cold, is signified the pain of hell: and the meaning of it is, wheresoever man prepares a place for his future abode, if to the south, when he falls, (that is, dies,) he shall abide to all eternity in the rest of paradise, and the glory of the kingdom of heaven."

He makes it the greatest absurdity, that a man should eat his own flesh; which yet follows from the doctrine of transubstantiation.

"But that expression, he eats his own flesh, is spoke by an hyperbole. V. What is an hyperbole? S. When any thing is expressed that is incredible. V. How is this expressed hyperbolically, he eats his own flesh? S. Because it is incredible that any man should eat his own flesh: but to aggravate the slothfulness of this fool, he saith, that he eats his own flesh, to shew that a fool rather desires his flesh should waste by hunger, and be consumed by the misery of want, than to support it by the labor of his hands."

These are all maxims concerning divers important articles, very different from the present maxims of the Church of Rome.

I grant that Prosper, who was a native of Aquitain, was no more than a layman; but he was in so great a reputation, that there were but few Bishops of his time, that have shewn more knowledge, or expressed more zeal for the defense of truth, than he did. This testimony is given of him by Cassiodorus, Photius, and Vasquez. Wherefore his testimony concerning the faith of his country must be of great weight with us.

Would we know the opinion of the Church of this diocese? He tells us of a small part of the body of Jesus Christ, thereby meaning the Eucharist or the Sacrament, which was given in little bits. And it is in the same sense that he speaks of a small part of the sacrifice; expressions that are utterly inconsistent with the notion of the Church of Rome concerning the carnal presence. And indeed it is plain in all his writings, that he follows the steps of St. Augustin, in his expressions and judgments of things which are contrary to those of the Church of Rome.

This we may see in his extract of the Sentences of St. Augustin, where he repeats what that Father had said upon Psalm 33 upon occasion of these words of the vulgar version, which says, that David *ferebatur in manibus suis*, in the presence of Achish. Where it clearly appears, that he understood those words, as well

as St. Augustin did, of the sacrament of his body, which may be called his body in some sense; that is to say, by way of likeness, as St. Augustin expresseth himself concerning it.

I cite nothing here from those other works, which are attributed to him, because indeed they are none of his.

I shall only observe two things: the first is, that in his Epistle to Demetrius he plainly shews, that he knew nothing of the doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning the necessity of the Minister's intention for the validity of the sacraments: for there he attributes all to the work of God, and not to that of the Minister, according to the doctrine of St. Augustin upon the question of the validity of baptism conferred by heretics.

The other is, that as he follows St. Augustin in the matter of free grace, as one may see in his poems gathered from the opinions of St. Augustin and his Sentences; so he rejects the doctrine of merit and works, as a pure Pelagian doctrine, in several places of his writings.

Lastly, we must join with these authors, Arnobius the Rhetorician, (since it is very probable that he lived in Gallia Narbonensis, because he has dedicated some of his works to Leontius, Bishop of Arles, to the Bishop of Narbonne, and Faustus, Bishop of Riez, who died about the year 485.) Arnobius explains his belief in the matter of the Eucharist after this manner: We have received, saith he upon the fourth Psalm, wheat in the body, wine in the blood, and oil in chrism. So likewise on Psalm 104 he saith of Jesus Christ, that he administers not only the species of bread, but also of wine and oil. Thus it is he describes the Eucharist and baptism. We may observe likewise, that as he recommends to believers the consideration of these words, *sursum corda*, at the moment of their receiving these mysteries; so he doth not own that any receive the body of Christ besides those that fear him, and who by faith are made the sanctuary of God: thus he argues in his Commentaries upon Psalm 21 et 132.

As for Faustus, Bishop of Riez, whatever contests he had with those who defended the doctrine of St. Augustin in the matter of grace, which made Pope Gelasius condemn his writings; yet certain it is, that France has always had the highest esteem for him possible; and his name is registered in the catalogue of her saints in the Roman Martyrology, till it was expunged by Molanes in the last century. Neither hath this hindered but that to this day he is honoured and prayed unto, as a saint, in the diocese of Riez. His doctrine is as follows.

1. He rejects the merits of good works, and works of supererogation, as particularly as if he had had an eye to the Papists: "Wherefore, saith he, though we endeavor with all labors of soul and body; though we exercise ourselves with all the might of our obedience; yet nothing of all this is of sufficient worth to be rendered or offered up by us as a deserving recompence for heavenly good things. No temporal obedience whatsoever can be equivalent to the joys of eternal life. Though our limbs may be wearied with watchings, and our faces discoloured with fastings; yet when all is done, the sufferings of this time will never be worthy to be compared with that glory which shall be revealed in us."

He discourseth much at the same rate concerning grace and free-will.

2. We see clearly that he did not own the existence of the body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, in the manner of a spirit, because he maintains all creatures to be corporal; and that the soul is distinctly in a certain place, because if it were otherwise, we must conclude it to be every where. That which is very strange is, that Mamertus, who hath refuted him, doth yet more directly thwart this doctrine of Rome, by the various hypotheses which he proposeth when he confutes this Faustus, Bishop of Riez. But this century hath detained me too long; I proceed now therefore to consider the state of these dioceses in the sixth century.

CHAPTER 6

The state of these dioceses in the sixth century.

We do not find so many authors of these dioceses in the sixth century, as we have had in the foregoing; but however, those we have of them are sufficient to inform us what their state was. I begin with St. Caesarius, Bishop of Arles, who assisted at the Council of Agde in the year 502, and died in 542; so that he reached almost the middle of this century.

This great man fully represents the notion that he had of the Eucharist, when he shews, that in baptism there is the same change, and the same presence of the blood of Jesus Christ, which he owns in the Eucharist; as appears in the 4th and 5th Homily. But in his 7th Homily he speaks in such a manner as needs no commentary:

"And therefore since he was now about to withdraw his assumed body from our eyes, and carry it up to heaven, it was needful that the same day he should consecrate for us the sacrament of his body and blood, that he might continually be remembered by the mystery which was once offered up for our redemption:" that so seeing his intercession for the salvation of man was daily and continual, the offering up of our redemption might be perpetual also, that this everlasting sacrifice might live in our memory, and be always present by grace.

2. Though he speaks of the Eucharist as changed into the body of Jesus Christ by the power of God, yet he maintains that it is by faith, and by the acts of understanding, that we can partake thereof. See how he speaks to a Christian who hath been regenerated by baptism. "Wherefore as without any bodily feeling, having laid aside what before thou esteemedst advantageous, thou art suddenly become clothed with a new dignity; and as it is not thy eyes, but thy understanding that persuades thee that God hath healed what was wounded in thee, blotted out thy sins, and washed away thy stains; so when thou goest up to the venerable altar to be satisfied with food, thou mayest see the sacred body and blood of thy God by faith, admire it with reverence, reach it with thy mind, receive it with thy heart, and above all, take it in with thy soul."

3. He expressly asserts, that the body which the Priest distributes is as well in a little part as in the whole; which agrees only with the Sacrament, and not with the natural body of Jesus Christ.

4. He maintains, that the oblation of the bread and wine made by Melchizedeck did typically signify the sacrifice of Jesus Christ; which is absolutely false, if it be true that the consecration destroys the nature of the things offered, as the Church of Rome believes. Hear what he saith: "He therefore, in Melchizedeck, (whose genealogy or original was unknown to those of that time) by the offering of bread and wine did foreshew this sacrifice of Christ: of whom the prophet pronounceth, Thou art a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchizedeck. And blessed Moses also speaking of this mystery, signifies the wine and blood with one word; Long before, (pointing at the Lord's passion) in the blessing of the patriarch, he shall wash his garment in wine, and his clothes in the blood of the grape.

Mark how evidently it appears, that the creature wine is called the blood of Christ. Consider what thou art further to inquire concerning this twofold species, seeing the Lord himself witnesseth; Except saith he, you shall eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you; which testimony is a most evident and strong argument against the blasphemies of Pelagius, who impiously presumes to maintain that baptism ought to be conferred upon infants, not to obtain life, but to attain the kingdom of heaven: for by these words of our Lord pronounced by the Evangelist, you shall not have life in you, is plainly understood that every soul that hath not been baptized is not only deprived of glory, but life also."

Lastly, in the same sermon, he saith, in conformity with the notion of St. Cyprian, about the mixture of the water with the wine in the chalice, that by the water is represented the figure of the nations, and by the

wine the blood of the passion of our Savior, which supposeth the subsistence of the wine, as well as of the water, and utterly overthrows the doctrine of transubstantiation.

2. He overturns the notion of the Romish purgatory, and follows here also the sentiments of those of the ancients who removed purgatory to the last day of judgment.

"But if neither in our tribulations we bless God, nor redeem our sins by good works, we shall so long abide in that purgatory till all our lesser sins be consumed, like wood, hay, and stubble. But somebody may say, What matter is it how long I stay there, so I may but at last pass through into eternal life? Let no man say so, most dear brethren, forasmuch as this purgatory fire is more painful than any thing that can be thought, seen, or felt in this world. And seeing it is writ of the day of judgment, that it shall be one day, how can any one know whether he may be days, months, or even years, in passing through it?"

3. In his 12th Homily he exhorts the people not to go out of the church on Sundays, before the celebration of the Eucharist; and makes the prayers of the priest to appear ridiculous, when there are no communicants to receive: to whom, saith he, shall the priest say, *Sursum corda*? But we are especially to observe, that when he presses the greatness of the sacrifice of the mass, and the adoration due to the Sacrament, he says never a word of what some Popish orator would represent to us on the like occasion.

4. In the 20th Homily he exhorts the country people to read the Scriptures, and removes all excuses which they might make to avoid this duty, with as much earnestness as those of the Church of Rome expressed, when they would dissuade their auditors from the reading of it.

5. The 38th Homily is a collection of several places of Scripture, treating of the means by which remission of sins is granted to us. He reckons up there twelve several means, where we are to take notice, first, that he doth not speak one word of confessing to a priest, nor of the power God hath bestowed on them to pardon sins, as judges, which at present is the great and only mean to obtain the pardon of sin; those other, whereof St. Caesarius speaks, being of no use without the pardons pronounced by the priest, in the tribunal of confession.

That which is here peculiar is, that though he has said a very great deal about the efficacy of contrition for the remission of sins, in his 29th Homily he has not been able to avoid the *caute lege* of the Romish censors, as we may see in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, of the Paris edition. Secondly, we are to observe, that whereas the Church of Rome pretends to find the sacrament of extreme unction and auricular confession in the fifth chapter of St. James's Epistle; Caesarius discovers nothing there, but the Christian duty of praying one for another, proceeding from the charity we owe to our neighbor. Ruricius was Bishop of Limoges from the year 535, in which he assisted at the first Council of Auvergne: he assisted also at the fourth Council of Orleans in 541, and at the fifth in 549.

We have nothing left us of this Prelate, save his two books of Epistles; though even there we can inform ourselves about several very important matters, which demonstrate what the faith was that was then received and embraced in Aquitain.

1. He takes for granted that dying persons are immediately taken up into heaven; so far is he from mentioning purgatory. See in what manner he comforts Namacius and Ceraunia, for the loss of their son.

"Indeed you have reason to take a great deal of comfort from the will of Christ, since untimely death was his lot, that he has been pleased to take him away in that state, to which he pronounceth the kingdom of heaven to belong, that at the same time you might have a patron instead of a son, and leave off deploring him as lost, whom you see the Lord hath taken to himself."

And in another place:

"Wherefore let your faith wipe off your tears, since we believe that those who are dear to us do not lose their life, but change it, they leave this world full of sorrows, and hasten to the region of the blessed, and take their leave of this painful pilgrimage, that they may arrive at the land of rest."

2. He supposeth Abraham's bosom and heaven to be the same thing, when he brings in a young woman that enjoyed the glory of heaven, speaking after this manner:

"Wherefore, my loving parents, rather bewail your own sins, and seriously think of redeeming your own crimes, that if you love me in Christ, you may be thought worthy to be admitted into the Patriarch's bosom, where the Lord, according to the purity of my innocence, and his great kindness, has placed me," etc.

3. He exhorts a lady of his acquaintance to the reading of holy Scripture, when he sent her a painter.

"But," saith he, "you ought to look for more perfect and great instruments in those divine writings from whence these are taken, if ever you desire to perfect what you have begun, or attain what is promised you. If you thus seek, the Lord will give you both knowledge and strength to understand what you read, and keep what you understand."

St. Ferreolus, Bishop of Uzez, must not be forgot by us: he was chosen in the year 553, and died in 581. We find in the rule that he writ for Monks, that he settled in his diocese an uncommon strain of piety.

1. We do not find him to demand the approbation of this his rule at Rome, as has been done for some ages since. He sends to the Bishop of Die, to desire his advice, and afterwards published it with the approbation only of that Bishop, without troubling himself about any other authority.

2. He orders his Monks to work with their hands, that they might not be chargeable to the public, as all the orders of Mendicants are at this time.

3. He receives none but such as are come to men's estate, and will have them tried before they be admitted; whereas St. Bennet ordained, that those whom their parents had presented to a monastery, should from their infancy be received and abide there.

4. He will have the great employment of the Monks to be the reading of the Psalms, which he will have them go through every week.

5. He will have them on anniversary days of the martyrdom of the saints, to read the acts of their martyrdom, for a worthy celebration of the memory of their passion; but not a word of encouraging the Monks to offer up prayers to them on these solemn days.

6. Above all he requires of every Monk daily to read the Scripture, and not to dispense with it upon any pretense, or because of any other business whatsoever.

Fortunatus was born in Italy, but coming into France in the year 575, he stayed there in the service of St. Radegunda, and was ordained Priest at Poitiers, where he lived in great reputation till the end of that century.

Some will have him to have been raised to the episcopal dignity in the same city, but this appears to be wholly uncertain. Gregorius Turonensis, who often mentions him as his friend, never gives him any other title but that of Priest. However it be, it appears by his writings that he was very far from Popery; in these following articles.

1. He never in the Life of St. Martin attributes to that holy man, that upon any occasion he prayed to the saints for the working of his miracles. This we may see in his relation of St. Martin's raising a child to life.

2. He looks upon all Bishops as the Vicars of St. Peter; accordingly he saith to the Bishop of Metz; *Apparet Petri vos meruisse vices*: It appears you have deserved to be St. Peter's Vicar.

3. We meet with nothing more commonly in the epitaphs which he made than this notion, that deceased believers are in heaven; from such expressions as these; *Hunc tenet ulna Dei. Inter apostolicos credimus esse choros. Non hanc flere decet, quam Paradisus habet*. Accordingly also he maintains that Abraham's bosom is the heavenly glory.

Lastly, it appears from an exposition he hath made on the Apostles' Creed, that he owned no doctrines, besides those contained in that ancient formulary, as articles of his faith, because he makes no mention at all of those new articles which the Church of Rome hath added to that Creed, and which she imposeth on her people, as another part of that which makes the object of faith.

It cannot be denied but that the spirit of superstition had already made a considerable progress in all places; we meet with an illustrious example thereof in the diocese of Marseilles, which joined to Gallia Narbonensis: the people there began to render a religious worship to images, whereupon Serenus, the Bishop of Marseilles, was forced to follow the method of St. Epiphanius, in breaking the images to pieces, which drew upon him the censures of Gregory I. who exhorts him to erect them again, though he commends him for having opposed himself to their adoration, and exhorts him carefully to instruct the people, to prevent their falling again into idolatry. And it is natural to conclude, that this excess of the people met with the same checks in many other places.

CHAPTER 7

The state of the dioceses of Aquitain and Narbon, in the seventh century.

I am come to the seventh century, of which I have two pieces of great authority to produce: the first concerns the purity of these dioceses, in regard to their faith. There was a council held at Toledo in the year 633, whereat Silva, Bishop of Narbon, assisted, in the name of the Bishops of Gallia Narbonensis, and they began the Synod with a confession of faith, which shews, beyond all controversy, that nothing was looked upon by them as an article of faith, that was not received for such in the creed of the ancient Christians; for there was not so much as one word to be found there of all those articles which the Church of Rome imposeth upon those of her communion, as an addition to the primitive faith.

The second regards the practice of the public acts of religion, and that is the Gothic Liturgy, which of a long time was used in these dioceses; wherefore to make a fuller discovery of the religion of these provinces, it will be of importance to make some remarks upon this Liturgy, which was in use there.

It is not probable that all the parts of it are of equal antiquity, as may be seen by the office of the assumption of the blessed Virgin in soul and body, which was rejected in France, as a thing uncertain, towards the end of the ninth century, according to the testimony of Usuardus. One may make the same judgment of divers other offices, which are found in this Gothic Liturgy; the barbarism which appears in all its parts sufficiently shows its age: in the mean time, such as it is, it does not want the marks of a considerable purity, which, it seems, obliged Gregory VII. to abolish and suppress it with all his might.

1. We find in it the recital of the Apostles' Creed, as the only profession of faith, which the Churches of these provinces required of those who would be partakers of her communion.
2. We do not find in it any prayer addressed to saints. It supposeth all along, from one end to the other, that the saints pray in general for the Church; and on this ground it is, that therein they desire God to have regard to their prayers, and to receive their intercession, their suffrages, and so forth. There is no greater stress laid upon the power of the blessed Virgin with God, than on that of the patriarchs and apostles, yea, of the anchorets and virgins. True it is, that there is a solemn commemoration of divers saints, but it may easily be perceived, that it is only done out of a design to glorify God, by representing to themselves their examples, and forming or disposing themselves to imitate them. This is done in the office of St. Forrestus and Ferucio. We find divers confessions to God before the Liturgy, but none at all made to angels, to the blessed Virgin, or saints, as at this day is done in the Romish mass.
3. We find there no particular distinction for the Bishop of Rome, only that the Bishop of the city of Rome is called the first of Bishops. Mabillon in his preface triumphs because of this title, but he is extremely out in his account; for hath the first Bishop any jurisdiction over the second? the second over the third? We find there the prayer for the feast of St. Peter, but with a clause which Mabillon owns to be found in all the ancient missals, and is struck out of the Roman Liturgy, in order to extend the Papal monarchy over all the earth.

We do not find therein the least footstep of prayers for the Pope, which shews that the decree of the Council of Vaison, wherein it was ordained that prayers should be made to God for the Bishop of Rome, was not observed throughout Gaul; yea, what is more, the same Liturgy gives the title of Head of the Church to St. Paul, as well as to St. Peter. We find therein no adoration of the cross on Good-Friday.
4. We find therein an office for St. Saturninus, Bishop of Toulouse, who is looked upon as come from the eastern parts, in the place of St. Peter, which shews that all the Bishops of France considered themselves as the Vicars of St. Peter, as well as the Bishop of Rome: *Si quidem ipse Pontifex tuus ab orientis partibus in urbem Tolosatium destinatus, Roma, Garonae invicem Petri tui, tam cathedram, quam martyrium*

consummavit. "For this your Bishop being sent from the east to Toulouse, instead of Rome, has now upon the Garonne filled the chair, and consummated the martyrdom of your Peter."

5. We find therein that the confession of St. Peter was the foundation of the Church; and the festival of his chair is therein referred to his bishopric. *Testis est dies hodierna beati Petri cathedra episcopatus exposita: in qua fidei merito revelationis mysterium, Filium Dei, confitendo, Praelatus Apostolus ordinatur. In cujus confessione est fundamentum Ecclesiae; nec adversus hanc petram portae inferi praevalent*. "St. Peter's episcopal chair, which is shewn to this day, can testify this; wherein by reason of his faith, when he confessed that mystery that was then revealed, even the Son of God, he was ordained a Bishop. In whose confession is the foundation of the Church; neither shall the gates of hell prevail against this rock."

6. We read there, that the gates of hell do not signify errors, as the Church of Rome will have it, but the state of the dead, from whence the faith which St. Peter hath professed delivers those who imitate him: "Let us pray," saith he, "that the souls of the deceased being brought up out of hell, the infernal gates may not prevail over the dead, because of their crimes, which the Church believes are overcome by the faith of the Apostle."

7. We find there, as in the Romish mass, an high abjuration of the doctrine of the merit of works: and though we find the word merit often used in it, yet we also meet with those necessary explications of it, as are sufficient to hinder any wrong impression that may be made by a word of an ambiguous sense.

8. I do own that we find in it the prayer for the dead, but there are a hundred other passages which speak them to be in peace, in the peace of God, that they are at rest; and other expressions, which very plainly import that they had not received the notion of purgatory, no more than the authors of the Roman Liturgy had at that time.

I know there are some passages in it, which seem to suppose the souls departed to be in a place of torment; but I have two things to say to this point; the one is, that those missals, whose style comes near to the belief of the Church of Rome, are of a later date: the other is, that the ordinary article, *pro paesantibus*, for those who are at rest, imports nothing like a place of torment. To these two considerations we may add, that what is ordinarily requested for them, is either that they may have a part in the first, that is to say, a more early resurrection, which is the same with the opinion of the millennium: or that they may be written in the book of life, or carried into Abraham's bosom: which shews that the state of souls after death was not more certainly determined by those who governed these churches at this time, than by the members of the Catholic Church any where else.

We read that there are divers flocks, whereof each Bishop is the pastor, as well St. Cyprian as Cornelius. Indeed we find that to every bishop is given the title of *summus Pontifex*, and *summus Sacerdos*. "Grant unto us, Lord, who this day are celebrating the anniversary of the decease of thy high Priest and our Father, Bishop Martin."

We see there the manner of administering baptism, with the unction or anointing called the *chrismation*; but we do not find that they made two sacraments of them, as the Church of Rome has since done.

We find there also the consecration of wax tapers, but yet without ascribing to them all those virtues which the Church of Rome attributes to her consecrated tapers in the Roman order.

But I go on to that which is most considerable in this Liturgy. Mabillon, who hath published it in France, according to the copy printed at Rome, pretends that it expressly shews, that the Churches which made use of this Liturgy held the doctrine of the real presence. If, instead of some passages that he quotes, we could find there a precise order for adoring the Sacrament after consecration, as being become the body of Jesus Christ, which we do not find in any part of it, there would, indeed, be some ground for his pretension; but there is not so much as a word to this purpose; which makes it evident, that in these dioceses they had not received this doctrine, nor the natural consequences of it, any more than in any other part of the Catholic Church; for we find that as soon as ever this opinion was entertained, it was immediately followed with supreme adoration.

Neither do we find any thing therein of the sacrifice of the mass, any more than of the adoration of the Sacrament, which is another consequence of the real presence.

We do not find any masses there without communicants. St. Caesarius, whom I have already cited, would have accounted them ridiculous, and a mere profanation.

Lastly, we do not find that the communion under one kind was there thought to be a consequent, as it hath been in the Church of Rome, of the real presence: and yet one would think that the fear of profaning the blood of Jesus Christ, as being very subject to be spilt, ought to have obliged them to take the same precautions as the Church of Rome has since done to prevent such dreadful, and yet such common, inconveniences.

If Mabillon had well considered these essential defects, which a Papist cannot but naturally meet with in this Gothic Liturgy, in all appearance he would not have been so lavish of his judgment. But without making use of these just anticipations, upon the matter in hand, let us consider a little, whether the attentive examination of the Liturgy be not sufficient to clear these prejudices, and oblige him to put another sense upon the words, which he hath wrested to confirm his assertion.

The characters we meet with in this Liturgy are these:

1. It makes a great distinction between that which is taken with the mouth, and that which is received by the heart. Grant, O Lord, that what we have taken with our mouths, we may receive with our minds, and that the temporal gift may be to us an eternal remedy. This observation is decretory; for the transubstantiators own that both good and bad receive the body of Christ. Goffridus Vindocinensis expressly asserts it, notwithstanding that St. Augustin has rejected it as a great absurdity.

2. It supposeth likewise that Jesus Christ is above the heavens, and that he is no otherwise near to us than by the communion of our nature, which he hath taken to himself. *Ut qui te consortem in carnis propinquitae laetantur, ad summorum civium unitatem, super quos corpus assumptum evexisti, perducantur*: "That they who rejoice to see thee their brother, in the nearness of thy flesh, may be brought up to the unity of those highest citizens, above whom thou hast carried up thy assumed body."

3. It supposeth the Sacrament to be only a commemoration; We remember thy suffering, and thy body broken for the remission of our sins. Which is a plain allusion to the words of St. Paul, 1 Corinthians 11:24 and shews that the authors of this Liturgy did understand them of the cross, and not, as the Church of Rome doth, of the Eucharist. The Ambrosian and Gallican Liturgies have followed the sense of the Gothic Liturgy, which deserves some observation. We meet with the same thing again:

"Thou didst command by Moses and Aaron thy servants, that the Passover should be celebrated by the offering of a lamb for ever, until the coming of Christ; and hast commanded the same custom to be observed for a memorial."

4. It supposeth that we receive the body of Jesus Christ spiritually: "Let us, dearest brethren, who have been fed with the food of heaven, and refreshed with the cup of the eternal wine, render never-ceasing praises and thanks to our God, begging of him, that we who have spiritually received the sacred body of our Lord Jesus Christ, being freed from fleshly vices, may deserve to be made spiritual."

What it means by the word spiritual is very plain, where it calls the dove that appeared at the baptism of Jesus Christ, *spiritalis columba*. And the spiritual dove descending upon his head by the Holy Ghost, that camest thyself. Thus it calls the Eucharist spiritual sacrifices; He hath refreshed us with the heavenly bread and the spiritual cup.

5. It takes for granted, that the believers of old did eat the same living bread, which Jesus Christ gives us:

"For he himself is the living and true bread that came down from heaven, and always dwells in heaven, who is the substance of eternity, and the food of power. For thy word, by which all things were made, is not only the bread of human souls, but of the very angels themselves. By the nourishment of this bread, thy servant Moses was enabled to fast forty days and nights, when he received the Law, and abstained from carnal food, that he might be the more capable of tasting thy sweetness, living on thy word. Let this living and true bread, which came down from heaven, that he might give food to the hungry, yea that he himself might be the food of the living, become to us such bread as that our hearts may be strengthened thereby; that so in the power of this bread we may be enabled to fast these forty days without any impediment from flesh and blood."

6. It calls the Sacrament, gifts laid upon the altar.

"Be pleased to sanctify, O Lord, these gifts which we offer upon thy altar, offering immaculate sacrifices upon the holy altar. Let us beseech the Almighty, through his only begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath vouchsafed to bless and sanctify these gifts by the offering up of his body and blood, that he would be pleased also to bless the gifts offered by his servants."

7. It calls the Sacrament, *salutiferam Dominicae immolationis effigiem, in sacrificio spiritali Christo offerente transfusam*: "The salutiferous representation of our Lord's offering up of himself transfused into the spiritual sacrifice, whereof Christ himself is the sacrificer or offerer."

8. We find there a prayer, whose title is, A Collect for the Breaking of the Bread after Consecration. Which scarce proves, that they were persuaded that the substance of the bread was destroyed by the consecration.

9. The same which in some places it calls the body of Christ, it elsewhere calls the Sacrament of the body.

10. It reduceth all to the virtue of the Eucharist.

"Keep within us, Lord, the gift of thy glory, and let us by the virtue of the Eucharist, which we receive, be armed against all the pollutions of the world."

11. It supposeth that the body of Jesus Christ abides within us, and prays that it may continue there incorruptible.

"Hear the prayers of thy family, Almighty God, and grant that these holy things which we have received of thy gift, we may by thy gift keep uncorrupted within us."

And again;

"Let us with unanimous prayer entreat the Divine Mercy, that these saving Sacraments being received into our inward parts, may purify our soul, and sanctify our body, and confirm our hearts and minds in the hope of heavenly things."

12. It calls the Eucharist holy bread:

"Bearing in mind the most glorious passion of our Lord, and his resurrection from the lower parts of the earth; we offer up unto thee, O Lord, this unspotted sacrifice, this holy bread, and this saving cup, beseeching thee," etc.

13. It calls the Sacrament holy mysteries, in several places.

These many instances one would have thought might have obliged Mabillon to believe that the authors of this Liturgy did speak figuratively in some other places, where they seem to speak more strongly, and to give us another notion; especially considering the manner of their expressing themselves, when they speak

of the feast of St. John Baptist. "It is worthy and just, equal and saving, for us always to give thanks to the almighty and merciful God, and in this banquet of thy Sacrament to join the head of thy martyr by an evangelical commemoration, and to offer it upon thy propitiatory table, as in a dish of shining metal."

And we may add several others upon each of those passages which seem the most likely to deceive us.

If we had the Canon of this Liturgy, which these gentlemen did not think fit to give us, we should there easily find the solution of these difficulties; for it is very probable, it was like that of the Ambrosian Liturgy, where it was so clearly specified, that the bread was the figure of the body of Jesus Christ, as that it put an end to all manner of cavillings on the point. Indeed these words, the figure or representation of the sacrifice of our Lord, do plainly shew, that this was their meaning. But we must make a shift to help ourselves with what they have been pleased to give us. It is easy to judge what those passages were, which Mabillon judged to be most favorable to his cause; for he hath caused them to be printed in great characters, that nobody might pass them by.

Thus the word truth seemed to him to determine the question of the real presence: the words are these:

"We beseech thee, Almighty God, that like as we do now perform the truth of the heavenly Sacrament, so we may cleave to the truth of the body and blood of our Lord."

But this learned Benedictine has suffered himself to be overtaken by his own prejudice; The author of the Liturgy distinguisheth two times; the one before the death of Jesus Christ, which was only an obscure image of a thing that was to come; this is that which is expressed in these words: "Or that the living bread, by denying of himself, should not afford life; but for the redemption of his possession, and the praise of his glory, what before he vouchsafed in a parable, he may now vouchsafe in truth."

The other, wherein the death of Jesus Christ hath authorized the signification of the Eucharist; upon which account he calls it the truth of the heavenly Sacrament. We have a like expression of Baptism, alluding to the passage of the Red sea, in one of St. Augustin's Homilies upon Nicodemus's coming to Jesus Christ, related by Paulus Diaconus, In inventione S. Crucis; and it is the same we find also in several passages of St. Caesarius.

We find that the word transformation has perfectly charmed him. "We therefore, Lord, keeping these institutes and precepts, do most humbly beseech thee, that thou wouldst be pleased to receive, bless, and sanctify this sacrifice, that it may be to us a true Eucharist, in thy own and son's name, and of the Holy Ghost; that so there may be a transformation of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, thy only begotten,"

etc. And in a marginal note he observes, that the same word is made use of in this Liturgy:

"That it may please thee to send down thy Holy Spirit upon these solemnities, that it may be to us a true Eucharist, in thy own and Son's name, and of the Holy Ghost, for a transformation of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, thy only begotten; that it may bestow upon us, who eat it, eternal life, and the everlasting kingdom to those that shall drink it."

And also,

"That thy blessing may come down upon this bread and wine, for the transformation of thy Holy Spirit; that blessing thou mayest bless them, and sanctifying thou mayest sanctify them,"

etc. And the like in other missals as ancient as this; which he observes also in his preface.

But this, after all, signifies nothing else but the change which the Holy Ghost produceth in making the elements, after consecration, to become the Sacrament of the body of Jesus Christ. This is that which our authors have fully justified by an infinite number of examples borrowed from Baptism, and other things

consecrated by prayer. Boethius, in his books, *De Consolatione Philosophiae*, saith, *Conversi in malitiam, humanam quoque amisere naturam. Evenit ergo, ut quem transformatum vitiis videas, hominem existimare non possis*. "Being turned into malice, they at the same time lose human nature: so that if you see one transformed by vice, you cannot look upon him as a man."

And Ratramnus, in his book of the body and blood of our Lord, saith, that Jesus Christ in former times could change the manna, and water out of the rock, in the wilderness, into his flesh and blood: the same Ratramnus that opposed Paschasius, who was the first publisher of the doctrine of a real change.

We find there the notion of *vertere* and *convertere in carnem*: "Beseeching, that he who then changed the water into wine, would be pleased now to change the wine of our oblations into his blood."

And again;

"Let us entreat him, that he who, as at this day, by his Son, turned the species of water into wine, would be pleased, in like manner, to change the oblations and prayers of us all into a divine sacrifice, and to accept them as he did accept the offering of Abel the just, and the sacrifice of Abraham his Patriarch."

But the appearance of this seeming difficulty we find in the following leaf. Besides, that it is ridiculous to suppose the real change of the prayers of believers into the body and blood of our Savior, which is supposed of the oblations.

We meet with an expression which seems somewhat strange: "O Jesu Christ, who in the evening of the world wast made an evening sacrifice on the cross, vouchsafe to us, that we may become new sepulchres for thy body."

Though indeed these expressions plainly shew, that they are only intended for the prefiguring the death of Christ, according to the notion of Rabanus Maurus.

We find there frequently, that the Sacrament is said to be a remedy for the body, and an expiation for the soul; but this doth no more suppose the carnal presence, or the expiation, which is the fruit of a propitiatory sacrifice, than that which we find in the Roman Order, in blessing a grave, that it may be a saving remedy to the party resting in it, for the redemption of his soul.

In the same Liturgy, they say to God,

"Do thou therefore so come down into the present oblation, that it may afford healing unto the living, and refreshment unto those who are dead."

But this regards only the presence of virtue, as in the Roman Order; they beg of God that he would afford his presence and majesty in Baptism. There is mention likewise made of the immolation of the body of Jesus Christ; but this is only said by way of resemblance, as St. Augustin explains it in his 23d Epistle to Bonifacius; for in other places this Liturgy speaks of bread offered up.

There is also mention made of a sacrifice. But first, he gives that name to the Eucharist, which every where throughout this Liturgy is termed a sacrifice of praises and thanksgivings. Secondly, it compares the sacrifice with that of Melchizedek, wherein every one knows there was nothing of transubstantiation. This is that which Rabanus explains, lib. 1. de Institut. Clericor. c. 31.

Mabillon particularly triumphs, when he takes notice of a passage which is found in the 78th Office.

"He offered up himself first to thee a sacrifice, and first taught himself to be offered."

These words, offered up himself, seem to him to be applicable to the act of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist; but he must not take it ill if we tell him, that it is not true, that he then offered up any sacrifice: the sacrifice of Jesus Christ consisting only in his death on the cross; the Eucharist, where he had only his death before his eyes, was only the memorial of his sacrifice, his offering consisting only in his death. If he did offer up himself in the Eucharist, then was he already dead, which is a notion attributed to Gregory Nissen, but is refuted by the Divines of the Church of Rome as impertinent.

Some, it may be, will imagine, that the authors of the Gothic Liturgy take away all equivocation, when they say,

"Let us receive that in the wine which flowed from thee on the cross."

But indeed here we have reason to admire how far strong prejudices will carry men, so as even to hinder common sense from acting; for really there can be no notion more opposite to transubstantiation: since this notion represents the state in which Christ was given to us, that is, a state of death, which is contrary to the Popish notions, by which they believe him alive in the Eucharist. Besides, it is absolutely false, that Jesus Christ did after his resurrection retake the same blood which he lost on the cross. The Church of Rome pretends that she hath it in her keeping, and it is shown in I do not know how many places. This expression is well known to be St. Augustin's, whose doctrine is vastly opposite to that of transubstantiation, as De Marca hath been forced to acknowledge. This is what I thought might be observed concerning this Gothic Liturgy, which was used amongst the Visigoths, and which mentions no saint of later standing than St. Leodegarius, who died in the year 677. Now because Pope Adrian the First engaged Charlemain to abolish the Gallican Liturgy, which was very different from the Roman, endeavoring by this means to subject the Gallican Churches to himself, under the plausible pretense of making them more uniform with the Church of Rome; Gregory the VIIth undertook to suppress the Gothic Liturgy, which was not less, but rather more different; because the Popes after Adrian I. had made great changes in the Roman Liturgy, and had enriched it with many novelties, which the ages after Gregory the First had produced in religion. However it be, thus much is evident from what I have observed at the beginning of this chapter, that in the seventh century, in which this Liturgy was in use in these dioceses, there was nothing less known than the Romish religion, as it concerns those articles which the Protestants reject as novelties. But let us proceed to take a view of the state of these dioceses in the eighth century.

CHAPTER 8

The opinion of the Churches of Aquitain and Narbon in the eighth century.

There was no part of Gaul so shaken and laid waste by the wars, as Aquitain and Gallia Narbonensis were in the eighth century. Though all France suffered in some measure, yet these two provinces were, during a long series of years, the theater of war and calamity. However, we may say that these mishaps served only to awaken the zeal of these people, and to make them the more sensible of the aversion they ought to have to the idolatry which reigned in the east; and which, it seems, God was willing to punish with the scourge of the Saracens, the great enemies of images and idolatry. For not only did the Bishops of these dioceses preserve their purity in the faith, which they made appear at the end of this century, by their opposing the opinions of Felix, Bishop of Urgel, and of Elipandus, Archbishop of Toledo, who revived Nestorianism; but they also gave a public testimony of their aversion to the worshipping of images, which the Popes asserted in conjunction with those of the east.

The judgment of these dioceses concerning images appeared in public, when their deputies assisted at the Council of Francfort, which condemned the second Council of Nice, notwithstanding that it had been approved by the Pope. The second Council of Nice had in the year 787 ordained the adoration of images, under the penalty of being anathematized. The east was entirely overrun with this superstition; and what we have already seen of Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, makes it evident, that it had likewise made great progress in the west. Charlemain, and the whole body of the western Churches, if we except Rome, and some partisans of the Pope in Italy, were desirous to stop this torrent: England condemned the decrees of the Nicene Council, and censured them by the pen of the famous Alcuin. His writings were subscribed by all the Bishops of England, and sent to Charlemain. This great Emperor thereupon, in the year 794 assembled at Francfort a council of the Bishops under his government; that is, those of Italy, Aquitain, and Provence, as well to condemn Elipandus, Archbishop of Toledo, and Felix, Bishop of Urgel, as to make an inquiry into the acts of the second Council of Nice. They were examined in presence of the Pope's legates. And this Council finding that the second Council of Nice had anathematized all those who refused to render to the images of the saints the worship and adoration which are only due to the Trinity; she denied the service and adoration of images, despised the Nicene acts, and condemned those who received them. Now that we may exactly know the opinions which obtained in these dioceses, whose Bishops approved the book of Charlemain; the reader needs only consider carefully the positions of Charlemain against several opinions which have since prevailed in the Church of Rome.

1. In his preface, he expressly rejects traditions; when he saith, "that as for themselves, they were content with prophetic, evangelical, and apostolic writings."
2. He maintains, "that we are principally to believe the truth of the Hebrew original; *Hebraeae veritati potissimum fides adhibenda est.*" Thus he expresseth himself by way of opposition to translations, and the vulgar Latin in particular.
3. He lays it down for a rule, that God alone is the lawful object of religious worship.

"It is no small error to serve any thing with religious worship besides him who saith, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

And he repeats this afterwards; "Neither do we read that any thing is to be worshipped besides God; because it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve."

4. Would we know his opinion concerning the worship which at this day is given to angels and saints? We may find it, lib. 1. c. 9. p. 69. "Moreover," saith he, "forasmuch as we see that John in the Revelation is restrained by the angel from worshipping him; and that Peter, the Pastor of the Church, forbade the worship of the centurion; and that the chosen vessel, together with Barnabas, with a strong opposition,

rejected the adorations of the Lycaonians; we are without doubt to conclude from these examples, that adoration, which only belongs to God, who alone is to be worshipped and alone to be served, is not to be rendered to any creature whatsoever, except only by way of salutation, to express our humility."

So afterwards; "The Gospel rule of the doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, which is sometimes recommended to us in the words of our Lord himself, and sometimes by examples, sometimes is represented to us by oracles, either more obscure, or more plain and open; sometimes is taught in plain, and other times in figurative expressions, rejecting the adoration of all other things whatsoever, save only the adoration whereby we mutually salute one another, enjoins the adoration of God alone."

And again; "Neither men nor angels are in the least to be adored, save only by that adoration which is given to express our charity, and as a salutation."

5. He distinguisheth very well between the honor we give to saints, and that which we render to God, when he saith;

"God alone is to be worshipped, God alone is to be adored, God alone is to be glorified; of whom it is said by the Prophet, The name of him alone is exalted; and to the saints, who having triumphed over the Devil, do reign with him, veneration is to be rendered, either because they have fought courageously for the preservation of the state of the Church, or because they are known to assist it with their continual patronage and intercession."

So likewise; "We venerate the saints who are dead with the triumph of merits, but they are not to be adored with divine worship, for that very reason, because it is divine worship. Seeing therefore," saith he, "that God alone is to be worshipped, the martyrs and all other saints are rather to be venerated than worshipped, as we have said before in this book."

And the same thing we meet with also, c. 28. towards the end.

6. It appears clearly from what he saith concerning the means whereby we obtain remission of sins, that he owned no other sacraments of the Church besides Baptism and the Eucharist; for indeed he mentions only these two.

7. He was so far from owning either the infallibility of the Pope, or of a Council which the Pope hath approved, that he maintains it was a piece of folly to look upon the second Council of Nice as universal, and calls it a Council of one part of the Church only; and he afterwards censures the Fathers of that Council for giving it the title of universal, whereas it had been convened without the participation and consent of many Catholic Churches. This remark made such an impression upon the learned Jesuit Sirmondus, that he seems not to own the second Council of Nice as a general Council.

8. The Fathers of the second Nicene Council having made a comparison between the Eucharist and images, and used these following expressions, which are not to be found at present in the copies of that Council; As the body of our Savior passeth from the fruits of the earth into an excellent mystery; so images formed by the industry of artificers, pass to the veneration of those persons, according to whose likeness they have been wrought; Charlemain doth censure those who had made a parallel between images and the Eucharist, in such a manner as shews that he knew nothing of Romish transubstantiation. He saith,

"that the Eucharist is made by the hand of the priest, and by calling upon the name of God, both priest and people joining their prayers in the consecration thereof; whereas images stand in no need of consecration, but are made at the discretion of the painter. He saith, that Melchizedek did not present an image as a type of the body and blood, but bread and wine: that Moses commanded a lamb to be eaten as a type of our Savior, wholly rejecting the custom of worshipping images. That the Psalmist, who sang that men should eat the bread of angels, that is, Jesus Christ, hath also declared, that the makers of images are like unto the images they have made. That the Sacrament is of divine institution; whereas the insolent use of images is not only without Scripture, but also directly contrary to the writings of the Old and New Testament. That our Savior never instituted the memory of his suffering to be kept up by the works of artificers and worldly

arts, but by the consecration of his body and blood: that he was not willing that his faith and his confession should be expressed by pictures, but by the mouth and the heart."

We are carefully to take notice, that the authors of this book, who desired to exalt the sacrament of the Eucharist with all their might, never give the least hint that Jesus Christ had instituted it, to make it an object of adoration.

"They say, that the Eucharist, according to the judgment of St. Paul, is preferable almost to every other sacrament; that it is made invisibly by the Spirit of God, and consecrated by the Priest, who calls upon God; that it is carried by the hands of angels, and laid upon the altar of God in heaven; that it can neither increase nor be diminished; that it is confirmed by the Old and New Testament; that it is the life and nourishment of souls; that by its manducation it leads to the entrance of the heavenly kingdom; that it can never be abolished, no not in the time of persecution; and that nobody can be saved without receiving of it. Whereas images are visibly made by the hand of the workman, painted by the art of the painter, placed on the walls by the hands of men, that by them, if men inconsiderately abuse them, sins are increased; that they can increase and diminish in beauty, according to the ability of the workman; that age spoils them; that they only feed the eye; that they only bring to remembrance things past, by looking upon them; that they may be spoiled by taking wet; that they who keep to the true faith are saved, without having any regard to images. And to exaggerate the folly of their anathemas pronounced against those that did not worship them, they conclude that this anathema strikes at the saints of old, of whom we never read that they adored them; that the same was levelled at the martyrs, who from the baptismal font passed immediately to the kingdom of heaven, without any adoration of images; and lastly, that it is darted against little infants, who cannot worship them, and of whom, notwithstanding, the Son of, God saith, Suffer little children to come to me, etc."

I own that Charlemain censureth Gregory, Bishop of Neocaesaria, for giving to the Eucharist the name of the true image of Jesus Christ: for after having made out, that no artificer can form a true image of Jesus Christ, he adds, when he speaks of the Eucharist,

"that Jesus Christ did not offer up to God the Father for us in sacrifice any image or prototype, but himself; and that he who of old had been foretold by visible resemblances under the shadow of the Law, in the immolation of the lamb, and in some other things, as being the sacrifice that was to be offered, by truly accomplishing the things that had been prophesied of him in the oracles of the Prophets, did offer up himself to God the Father, for a saving sacrifice, and bestowed upon us, (the shadows of the Law being passed away,) not some imaginary sign, but the Sacrament of his body and of his blood. For the mystery of the blood and body of our Lord must not now be called an image, but the truth; not the shadow, but the body; not a type of things to come, but that which had been prefigured by the types of old. For now (according to the Song of Songs) the day is risen, and the shadows are gone. Now Jesus Christ, the end of the Law for righteousness to every one that believes, is come, he hath now fully accomplished the Law. Now upon those who sat in the region of the shadow of death a great light is risen. Now the vail is taken off from the face of Moses; and the vail of the temple being rent, hath opened to us all secrets and things hid. Now the true Melchizedek, Christ, the King of righteousness, and King of peace, hath bestowed upon us, not sacrifices of beasts, but the Sacrament of his body and of his blood, and hath not said, This is the image of my body and of my blood; but, This is my body, which shall be given for you, and this is my blood which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins."

But it is plain that Charlemain understands by the word image a prototype, like the shadows of the Law; with respect to which it is true, what many of the Fathers have said, that the sacraments of the New Testament are the body and the truth; though otherwise considered as sacraments, they are sacred signs, which cannot be confounded with the things signified by them, without renouncing the light of common sense. Moreover, we are to observe, that Charlemain never said that the Eucharist is properly the body of Jesus Christ. If he denies Jesus Christ to have said concerning the Eucharist, This is the image of my body, taking the word as a prototype and a shadow of things to come; yet he always holds that it is his body in a sacramental sense, for he never speaks of the Eucharist as the body of our Lord, without adding the restriction of sacrament, or of mystery. If, saith he, he hears the mystery of the body and of the blood once mentioned; and twice together, he hath bestowed upon us the sacrament of his body and of his blood; and lastly, the mystery of the body and of the blood cannot be called an image. Now the word mystery,

according to the constant use of the Church, properly signifies the symbol, the figure, the sacred sign of the body and blood of our Savior.

Lastly, we ought to observe, that though he says that the Sacrament is the body of Jesus Christ, yet he never saith that it ought to be adored. Indeed he ought to have drawn up an impeachment against these worshippers of images, upon this article, and a very important one too, because it is very evident that the Greek worshippers of images did not adore the Eucharist, but gave only a simple, veneration to it, like to that which they bestowed upon the cross, the altar, and the gospel, as one of their authors tells us, in a book which they call, *An Invective of the Orthodox against the Opposers of Images*, printed at the Louvre in 1685, in the collection of authors who have writ since Theophanes.

CHAPTER 9

The faith of the Churches of Aquitaine and Narbon in the ninth century.

Charlemain, that great man, who lived till the year 814, maintained the spirit of opposition against the errors and superstitions of the Church of Rome, that espoused the interest of the image-worshippers, by approving the second Council of Nice. This Council having established the authority of tradition, as being a necessary principle to support the worship of images, we find that the Churches of Aquitaine and Narbon kept themselves firmly to the authority of the Scriptures, grounding their faith thereon, and regulating their worship according to the same.

Of this we have an illustrious example in the Council of Arles, assembled in the year 813, by the order of Charlemain, whereat the Archbishop of Narbon assisted with his suffragans. For the Fathers of this Council thought fit to begin it with a profession of their faith, which is nothing but an extract of that creed which bears the name of Athanasius; and this is that which they ordain should be preached to the people for the Catholic faith, without so much as mentioning one word of those articles of faith that the Church of Rome now imposeth.

Charlemain had ordered a collection of homilies to be made out of the works of Origen, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, St. Augustin, St. Leo, St. Maxims, St. Gregory, and Bede, which he caused to be published in these dioceses, as well as the rest of his empire; now these homilies do so strongly oppose the most part of those novelties, which were then endeavored to be introduced, that this book for a long time served as a bar, to hinder people from leaning too much towards those things that incline men to superstition. There is no Protestant in the least versed in the matters of controversy, who seeing the names of those ancient Doctors comprised in this collection, will not remember how much these Fathers have opposed themselves to a multitude of corruptions which prevailed at last, by the factious endeavours of some of the latter Popes; wherefore I may excuse myself from making an extract of this collection, choosing rather to produce other witnesses, which the same diocese affords us, concerning the faith of these dioceses in the ninth century.

I can only produce three or four; but to recompense the smallness of their number, they are men against whose authority the most contentious adversaries will have nothing to oppose. In the first place it is certain, that as the Bishops of Aquitaine and Narbon had set themselves against the superstition and idolatry of the Greeks and the Pope in the matter of images at the Council of Francfort; so their successors imitated their zeal and vigor in the Synod at Paris in 824, upon the same question; where they determined that Pope Adrian, who had writ an answer to the book of Charlemain, and therein undertaken the defense of the second Council of Nice, had made use of in the said reply, superstitious testimonies, and not at all to the purpose, answering what he thought fit, and not what was agreeable. And besides they drew up a new collection of great numbers of arguments against this superstitious worship, to recall Pope Paschal and those of his party from their doating on images.

We can shew further, that the same zeal was continued in this diocese. Baluzius hath acknowledged, and so has Massonus before him, that the book of Agobardus, Archbishop of Lyons, concerning pictures, expresseth no more than the general opinions of the Bishops of France and Germany concerning this point. But it may not be amiss to quote it in particular, not only to shew what were the opinions of the Churches of Aquitaine and Narbon, (because though he was born in Spain, yet he had continued for a long time in Aquitaine, whither he was invited, because of the general esteem he had gained, to be the coadjutor to Leidradus, Archbishop of Lyons, to whom he succeeded;) but also because it appears by his works, that the most illustrious Bishops of Gallia Narbonensis carefully consulted him in matters of difficulty, as their master, being indeed a most famous doctor, able to instruct and inform them.

1. He declares, as St. Augustin did before him, that we can never equalize the authority of any interpreter whatsoever to that of the Apostles:

"The blessed Father Augustin has told us, that we ought to have quite another opinion of expositions than that which you hold; who, in his book against Faustus the Manichee, speaks not only of those which have been blamed by learned men, but also of those which have been approved of, after this manner. Which sort of writings, that is to say expositions, are not to be read with a necessity of believing, but with a liberty of judging; for those books only that are of Divine authority are to be read, not with a liberty of judging, but with a necessity of believing, which form the Apostle himself delivered, saying, Quench not the Spirit; despise not prophecies; try all things; hold fast what is good; abstain from every appearance of evil."

Which is absolutely false, if an infallible principle has continued in the Church; whether in the person of the Pope, or in Councils, or that we must of necessity explain Scripture according to the sense of the Fathers, as the Church of Rome has defined.

2. We see with what force he maintains the canons of the Gallican Church against the contempt which some cast upon them, because they had been made without the Pope's concurrence.

3. We do not find that in his time they applied to the blessed Virgin the words of the first promise, by reading, *Ipsa tuum conteret caput*, She shall bruise thy head; for he reads, *Ipse tuum*, He shall bruise, etc. when he disputes against Felix, Bishop of Urgel.

4. He maintains in the same place, that the notion of a people's being without sin, who yet confess themselves to be sinners out of humility, is pure Pelagianism.

"That if this is the property of humble saints, why then doth John the Apostle say, If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us; but if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins? Who, if like you, he had been inclined to have not mean, but great thoughts of himself; he had whereof he might glory, because he lay in the bosom of his Lord, and was beloved of him above the rest of his disciples. James the Apostle also saith, In many things we offend all; which if any shall imagine not to be spoke in truth, but by way of humility, let him know that therein he follows Pelagius."

5. He plainly declares that our communion in the Sacrament is the same with that of the believers of old, when he applies that passage of the 1st to the Corinthians, ch. 10 ver. 1 and 2, of the drinking of the Holy Ghost, and maintains in these terms that there is no other difference between the believers of the Old and New Testament, but this,

"that the great sacraments of salvation which are wrought by the Mediator for us and for them, save us as being already past, but them as yet to come, because we believe and hold what is past, they believed and held what was to come: they held them only in their minds, as figures of future things; but we in an open profession, vows, and declaration of things past, under the signification of sensible sacraments, as those two who carried one cluster of grapes upon a staff did indifferently do the same work, only that the one of them had it behind his back, and the other before his face."

I should be obliged to transcribe his whole book against pictures and images, if I should go about to extract all that it contains in opposition to the opinions of the Church of Rome. It will be sufficient for us to observe, that the Romish *Index Expurgatorius* hath forbid this book, as well as the rest, till its errors be expunged: and indeed it did deserve no less; for it maintains, according to the doctrine of St. Augustin, that we ought not to adore any image of God, but only that which is God himself, even his eternal Son; and that it is a piece of folly and sacrilege to vouchsafe any worship to images, and to call them holy, as the second Council of Nice had done. He refutes the excuse of the Council of Trent, which only considers those as idolaters, that attribute something of divinity to the image. He maintains it to be mere Paganism to have images for any other use than that of a memorial; and at the same time asserts, that images are of as little use and advantage as the picture of a mower, or of some hero in armor, can advantage a mower or soldier, who looks upon those pictures. In a word, he speaks exactly like a true iconoclast; for after he had said, that it was impossible any longer to bear with the abuses against which he had taken pen in hand, he adds;

"From whence we may plainly infer, that if Hezekiah, a godly and religious king, brake the brazen serpent, made by God's express command, because the mistaken multitude began to worship it as an idol, for which his piety was very much commended; much more religiously may and ought the images of the saints (they themselves approving it) be broken and ground to powder, which were never set up by God's command, but are absolutely human inventions."

But besides this, there are four other articles, which are as disrelishing to the Church of Rome as these:

1. He maintains that there is no other Mediator between God and man, save Jesus Christ, God and man, which he proves by the authority of St. Augustin, de Civ. Dei, 50. 9. c. 15.

2. He looks upon those as worthy to be anathematized and excommunicated from the Church of God, who should undertake to dedicate a Church to the most excellent of saints or angels.

"If any of us," saith he, "should make a temple of wood or stone to any, though the most excellent of saints, we ought for doing that to be anathematized from the truth of Christ, and from the Church of God, because by so doing we should give that worship to the creature, which is only due to the Creator."

3. Having given a relation of the manner how the faithful gathered up the bones of St. Polycarp, and interred them in a place where they intended to meet and celebrate his memory, to encourage believers to imitate the constancy of that martyr; he declares, that all manner of worship or honor done to them, over and above this, is unlawful, religious worship being due to God alone.

4. He proves that his judgment concerning these points is founded upon the example of the ancient Doctors, upon their opinions, and upon the book of the Sacraments of the Church of Rome, that it was the ground of the ancient Doctors of the Church, who rejected the worship which the Arians gave to Jesus Christ as idolatrous, though they owned him to be no more than a man.

The reader needs not take much pains to apprehend why Rome though fit to condemn these books of Agobardus; though he may be at a loss how it comes to pass, that notwithstanding all this, he is at this day held for a saint, and publicly adored at Lyons under the name of St. Agobo. This is a riddle which has strangely perplexed the learned Jesuit, Theophilus Raynaldus, as well as le Cointe, in his Annals of the Church of France. But he is not the only person that has opposed the belief and worship of the Church of Rome, and is publicly adored by her.

I have another author to produce, who gives us so clear an idea of the belief of this diocese wherein he was born, concerning the Eucharist, that the Papists have never been able to return any pertinent answer to it, save only this, that the passage we quote is supposititious. The person we speak of is Christianus Druthmarus, Monk of Corbie, whom it seems God was willing to oppose to the corrupt notions of Paschasius Radbertus, his Abbot. The passage is this, [And as they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed it and brake it.]

"After that he had fulfilled the command concerning the old Passover, and put an end to the old shadows, he makes a beginning of new grace, and of a new sacrifice. He took bread, which strengthens the heart of man, and which doth most of all support men's bodies, and in it placeth the Sacrament of his love: but much more doth that spiritual bread fully strengthen and comfort all sorts of creatures; because in him we move and have our being: first, he blessed it, because in him self who was man, he blessed all mankind; for having taken human nature upon him from the blessed Virgin, he thereby demonstrated that the blessing and power of the divine immortality was really therein. He brake the bread himself, because he voluntarily offered up himself to suffer; and that he might fill and satisfy us, he made no difficulty to break the mansion of his soul, as himself said; I have power to lay down my life, and have power to take it up again. [And gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body.] He gave to his disciples the Sacrament of his body for the remission of sins, and preservation of charity, that they, remembering this act of his, might always perform that in a figure which he was now about to do for them, and might not forget that, This is my body, that is in the Sacrament.

[And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying;] forasmuch as amongst all sorts of food, bread and wine are found to be the most effectual to strengthen and refresh our weak bodies, he with good reason thought fit by these two, to ratify and confirm the ministry of his Sacrament; for wine not only exhilarates, but also increases blood, and therefore is the blood of Christ very properly typified thereby; because whatsoever comes to us from him, doth enliven us with a true joy, and increaseth all our good. And lastly, as when a person that is to take a far journey, leaves to his friends that love him some pledge or token of his love, upon this condition, that they use it every day, that they may not forget him: so likewise hath God commanded us, having spiritually changed his body into bread, and the wine into blood, by these two, to remember what he hath done for us with his body and blood, and not to be unthankful to his most endearing love and charity; and because water is mingled with the Sacrament of his blood, it represents his people, for whom he was pleased to die. And neither is the wine without water, nor the water without wine; because as he died for us, so must we die for him, or for our brethren, that is, for the Church. Wherefore also water and blood came forth from his body. And whereas he saith, This is my blood of the new testament; this is added in contradistinction to that of the old testament, which by the blood of goats could not purge away sin from those who were still in bondage to sin. [But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when shall drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom.] The vine is Judaea, the wine that of the patriarchs, prophets, and other elect. For till that time, Judaea had brought forth clusters of grapes, from whence wine flowed forth, that is, works done in faith; but from the death of our Lord wild grapes only, until the time that Enoch and Elias shall carry them up into the kingdom, that is, the Church of Christ, at the end of the world. Or else more simply the words may be thus taken, that from the hour of his supping with his disciples, he would drink no more wine, until he was become immortal and incorruptible after his resurrection.

Whereas also he was pleased not to administer the Sacrament of his body and blood to his disciples till after they had supped, and that we are not commanded to take it fasting; this may be the reason the Lord had a mind to shew, that the figurative testament was only commanded till the true was come, and he had now put an end to the old testament, and instituted a new one, and therefore it was that he celebrated the old before the new. The Apostles also for a long time continued the same custom, and after their other food, took this by the Lord's appointment; but afterwards, when many Jews came to communicate, it was enjoined in a Synod, that every one (if he was cleansed from other sins) should first take the repast of spiritual bread, before he took that of the temporal."

This place, which contains an exact commentary upon the institution of the holy Supper, has much enraged the Papists; and they have wrested it into all senses, to avoid the threatening blow. Sixtus Senensis tells us, that in another copy, after the words, This is my body, that is in a Sacrament, was added, truly subsisting. But this copy was never yet produced, though they who reprinted the work of Druthmarus, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, of the Cologne edition, have been pleased to put this falsification of Sixtus Senensis in the margin.

Cardinal Perron, who was as able as any man of France to justify the fair dealing of Sixtus Senensis in the business of this manuscript of Lyons, but did not care to concern himself about it, hath boldly maintained, that he might with the more ease slip his neck out of the collar, that this passage of Druthmarus had been corrupted by the Protestants. But it hath been already shewn, that the edition published in 1514, by Wimpelingius, before Luther begun to write against Leo X. of which the Reverend Dr. Tenison hath a copy in his library, with the privilege of the Emperor Maximilian, and the arms of Pope Leo X. contains this passage whole and entire. So that it is obvious to judge, that Druthmarus, who was born in Aquitain, taught nothing at Corbie but what he had learned from his infancy, and that which was the common doctrine, before Paschasius had undertaken to publish his extravagancies, which he did not till the year of our Lord 835. We ought also here to take notice of an action that happened in this century concerning the Eucharist. In the year 844, Bernard, Earl of Barcelona and Duke of Septimania, made a treaty with King Charles the Bald, near the city of Toulouse, in the abbey of St. Saturninus, where they mingled the blood of the Eucharist with some ink, to sign the treaty they had agreed upon. The thing has been published by the famous Baluzius, in his notes upon Agobardus, and is lately reprinted by the same author. The words of Odo Aripertus, who relates the matter, translated, run thus: "The peace therefore being severally ratified and sealed by the King and Earl with the blood of the Eucharist; Bernard, Count of Toulouse, came from Barcelona to Toulouse, and did homage to King Charles in the abbey of St. Saturninus, near Toulouse."

Mabillon acknowledges that this was not a fact without example. Now let any man imagine, if he can, whether people that believe transubstantiation, would ever have been capable of such a profanation of the blood of Jesus Christ, or whether the Monks, in whose abbey the thing was done, would ever have suffered it, had the thing appeared as horrible unto them, as it must of necessity appear to those who defend the opinion of the Church of Rome.

I shall conclude this chapter with that courageous opposition which the Bishops of Aquitain and Narbon made in the year 876, in the Council of Pontyon, against the enterprises of Pope John VIII. who, being backed by the Emperor Charles the Bald, had a mind to subject all the Bishops of France and Germany to Anseghisus, Archbishop of Sens, as their Primate; but at the same time, as to his Vicar, that he might execute his decrees, and inform him of the most important affairs of those Churches, which he pretended ought to be decided and ended at Rome, which, if so, would have abolished the power of Synods and Metropolitans. This was in a manner the last considerable effort they ever made to preserve their ancient discipline; for soon after the Popes knew to manage the Kings, that stood in need of them in Italy, so well, that by little and little they at last gained the point, and so made themselves absolute, the Synods and Metropolitans retaining only an empty name, without almost any authority at all.

CHAPTER 10

The state of these dioceses in the tenth century.

We are now come to the tenth century, in which ignorance and barbarism overwhelmed well nigh all the west; and the Church of Rome fell at the same time into such monstrous corruptions, that those who have wrote the history thereof do not mention it without horror. I do not intend to make any stop here, in alleging proofs for what I say, from the concurrent testimonies of Genebrard, Baronius, and other Doctors of the Church of Rome. It is a thing not denied by any one that hath ever heard speak of the history of the Church; and hath been particularly set forth by Gerbertus, Archbishop of Rheims, who was afterwards advanced to the Papacy.

But yet in the mean time, whatever the corruption may have been, which was scattered elsewhere, we have good ground to believe, that it had not quite stifled the ancient doctrine and religion of these dioceses, which may be easily made out by the following observations:

1. I own that we find in the writings of Odo, the first Abbot of Clugny, who was born in Aquitain, some expressions which import that he inclined to the opinions of Paschasius, as appears in his collations; which might make one judge that this notion began then already to be propagated in Aquitain, whose Duke William was the founder of Clugny. But we must here take notice of two things: the first is, that the ancient customs of this monastery do plainly show, that when this congregation was founded, those who were the authors of these customs were not of Paschasius's opinion. This is evident from chapter 30 of the second book, and from chapter 28 of the third. The second is, that though Odo might have entertained this opinion of Paschasius concerning the carnal presence of Jesus Christ, yet we may easily observe that he never owned the consequences of it. For we find in the relation of the death of this Odo, who died at Rome in the year 942, that he received the Eucharist, but there is no mention made of any adoration that he paid at his receiving it.

2. We are to observe, that in this description of Odo's departure, which was made by one of his disciples, we meet with neither

confession before the receiving of the Eucharist, nor the receiving of the sacrament of Extreme Unction, which are sufficient proofs that he knew nothing of these sacraments.

3. It appears by the writings of Gerbertus, who was educated in the monastery of Aurillac, what was the faith of this diocese. He had been the tutor of Robert, son to Hugh Capet, who raised him to the archbishopric of Rheims in the year 991, in the room of Arnulphus, who was deposed. He hath writ an apology for the Council which deposed Arnulphus, wherein he gives full evidence what esteem he had for the Pope, and how little he believed the Papacy necessary to the Church, not only because of the vices of the Popes of his time, but also for several political reasons, which engage every Church not to subject themselves to a foreign power.

"Suppose," saith he, "that by the warlike incursions of barbarous nations there be no way open for us to go to Rome; or that Rome itself, being become subject to some barbarous prince, be at his pleasure made part of his kingdom, shall we in this case be reduced to the necessity of having no Councils at all? or shall the Bishops of the world, to the loss and ruin of their own kings, expect the advice and counsels of their enemies for the management of the affairs of Church and State?"

We may see another assertion of his in a letter to Seguinus, Archbishop of Sens:

"I do resolvedly affirm, that if the Pope of Rome himself should sin against his brother, and being often admonished, should not hear the Church, that this same Pope of Rome ought to be looked upon as a heathen and publican."

Whereupon Baronius exclaims, Here is a sentence indeed, worthy only to proceed from the mouth of some great heretic, or of some most impudent schismatic, which abrogates all sacred Councils at once, cuts the throat of Canons, strangles traditions, and treads under foot all the rights of the Church, that it seems impossible that a Catholic should ever dream of such things; much less so saucily utter and assert them. We may also gather from the subsequent words, whether or no he conceived communion with the Church of Rome to be of absolute necessity.

"If he (the Pope of Rome) do therefore judge us unworthy of his communion, because none of us will comply with him in his anti-evangelical sentiments, yet he cannot separate us from the communion of Christ; seeing a Priest ought not to be removed from his function except he have confessed, or be convict of the crime laid to his charge: especially when the Apostle saith, Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? And again, I am certain that neither death nor life, etc. And what greater separation can there be, than to debar any believer from the body and blood of the Son of God, which is daily offered up for our salvation? And if he be a murderer, that takes away the bodily life from himself or his neighbor, he that robs himself or another of eternal life, by what name shall we call him?"

We find in another letter which he wrote to Wilderodus, Bishop of Strasburg, what work he makes with those false decretals which were foisted in on purpose to make the whole Church submit to the Papal yoke, as if before Syricius all the east and west had belonged to the Papal jurisdiction; wherein he exactly follows the footsteps of Hincmar, who confuted them with all his might.

If we inquire into the rest of his opinions, we shall find, that he did not believe that the Popes had received the keys of the kingdom of heaven in any other manner than all other Bishops. See how he explains himself in a discourse to Bishops, when he was Bishop either of Rheims or Ravenna. "And as woe is me if I do not preach the Gospel, or if I hide long in my heart the treasure that I have received, burying it in the ground; or if I keep the candle of the divine word covered under a bushel, and do not expose it on a candlestick to the eyes of all: so likewise if I do not open the locks of human ignorance, with those keys of the kingdom of heaven, which all of us, who are Priests, have received in the person of St. Peter; so that upon this account I may deserve, according to my small measure, to hear that, Well done, good and faithful servant; because thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will set thee over many."

And again;

"For so the Lord said to St. Peter, Simon Peter, lovest thou me? and he, Thou knowest, Lord, that I love thee. And when he had asked this a third time, and had been as often answered, the Lord repeated a third time, Feed my sheep. Which sheep, and which flock, St. Peter not only received at that time, but also hath received them with us, and all of us have received them with him." He shews that he did not believe the necessity of the Priest's intention in the Sacraments, when he saith in the same piece, speaking to those that were guilty of simony,

"I do once more inquire of my brother Bishop, lest we should seem to have omitted any thing that belongs to a true proof and trial, who is it, brother Bishop, that confers episcopal grace? Is it God or man? God without doubt, but yet by man. Man lays on his hand, and God confers grace; the Priest serves God with his suppliant hand, and God blesseth with his powerful right hand: the Bishop admits thee into the order, but God makes thee worthy of it. O justice! O equity! If money be given to a man, who in ordination does no more but discharge a piece of service laid upon him, why is the whole denied to God, who bestows the order itself upon thee? Doth it seem just to thee to honor the servant, whilst thou dost affront the Lord? And whilst the Priest unrighteously takes money, shall God be injured by man? And seeing God expects nothing from thee, for the order bestowed upon thee, why doth the Priest impudently look for money? God is willing to bestow it upon man for nothing, but the ravenous Bishop demands money. God of his kindness and love vouchsafes it for nought, but the malicious Priest captivates him, and ties him to terms: for what hast thou that thou hast not received? And if thou have received it, why dost thou boast, as if thou hadst not received it?"

Lastly, we see in his 26th epistle the confession of faith that he makes, which contains nothing besides the symbol or the Apostles' Creed, to which he adds only what follows:

"I do not forbid marriage...I do not condemn second marriages; I do not blame the eating of flesh; I own that reconciled penitents ought to be admitted to the communion. I believe that in Baptism all sins, whether original or actual, are forgiven; and do profess that out of the Catholic Church nobody can be saved; and I confirm and ratify the four holy universal Synods, which the mother-church confirms and approves of."

It is worth observing, that he doth not speak one word concerning the Romish traditions; so far was he from authorizing the definitions of the second Council of Nice, which the Church of Rome hath been pleased to authorize in the Council of Trent.

Lastly, We may take notice, that Leuthericus, Archbishop of Sens, who died in the year 1032, had been the disciple of this Gerbertus, which is attested by the continuator of Aimoinus; and Clarius, Monk of St. Peter le Vif, at Sens, has accused Leuthericus of having laid the beginning, and cast the seeds of Berengarius's heresy.

I do not believe any one will think strange, that I have quoted Gerbertus amongst the writers of Aquitaine, under pretense, that probably he might have changed his opinions after that he was elevated to the Papacy, under the name of Sylvester II. It is but too well known to be customary, for those who used to speak according to their own judgment, and the opinions of the place where they were educated, as soon as they have been elevated to the Papal dignity, to change their notes. Of this we have an illustrious example in Aeneas Sylvius, whom we find quite transformed into another man as soon as he had taken upon him the name of Pius II. the Papal diadem having changed him from white to black. And I am much mistaken if the eleventh century doth not furnish us an example every whit as remarkable, in the person of Gregory VII. who having been before Prior of the monastery of Clugny, the customs whereof, as I have hinted, did not suit well with the doctrine of Paschasius, seems thence to have derived his opinions concerning the Eucharist; for Urspergensis takes notice that the Council of Bresse, where he was deposed by thirty Bishops, laid to his charge, that he was of Berengarius's opinion, as being his ancient disciple; and we shall find this accusation not to be without ground, if we cast our eyes on his Commentary on St. Matthew; of which I have elsewhere given an extract. Yet for all this, we see, that this Pope, complying with his own interest, became afterwards one of the most furious persecutors of Berengarius.

I suppose these few remarks will be sufficient for my purpose: though I might add, that St. Fulbert, as well as Leutherick, having been the disciple of Gerbert, had derived the same doctrine concerning the Eucharist from him; this is so certain, that a Doctor of the Sorbonne, named Villiers, found no other means, about the beginning of this century, to make him speak to his mind in publishing of his works, than by inserting some words in the text which might make it to be looked upon as the objection of heretics; whereas indeed it is an answer of his own, wherein he sets down his opinion, and he doth it in the self-same terms used by St. Augustin. But I keep myself within the bounds of what concerns those dioceses whose history I am upon.

I shall only take leave to add one thing, which is, that though Gerbertus seems in his twenty-sixth letter, which contains his Confession of Faith, to make an allusion to some of the opinions of the Manichees; yet we may be sure, that he did not express himself in this manner, to show, that he held nothing of their tenets; no, he had other reasons for it, which it is not necessary to unfold here. Besides, it is notorious that the Manichees did not spread themselves in Aquitaine till he was a very old man: at least, it is true, that Ademar doth not make them to appear in Aquitaine till the year 1011, and that the first Synod held against them, did not meet at Toulouse till the year 1019, that is to say, sixteen years after his death, which happened in 1003.

CHAPTER 11

The beginning of the Manichees in Aquitaine, and the state of those Churches as to religion in that age.

There appeared in Lombardy and in France some Manichees chased from the east by the Emperors of Constantinople. Ademar Cabannensis, Monk of St. Eparque, at Limoges, says, that they first were taken notice of in Aquitaine, a little after the year 1010, and he afterwards speaks of a Council assembled at Charroux against them. The Bishop of Meaux makes no question but that this gave rise of the Albigenses; and to evidence the solidity of his conjecture, he accuseth, besides some writers of the eleventh century, the Canons whom Robert caused to be burnt at Orleans, to have been the first disciples of these Manichees, supposing all this while that the Albigenses derive themselves from the same source, and that they defended the same opinions.

Now because it is a matter of small importance to the history of the Albigenses, whether the Canons of Orleans were Manichees or not, I might very well excuse myself from entering upon that inquiry. They may have been Manichees, and yet the Churches of Aquitaine and Narbon not the least concerned in the matter. Neither do I think myself obliged to repeat here, what I have already delivered concerning the differing opinions of the ancient and modern Manichees in the 15th, 16th, and 17th chapters of my Remarks upon the History of the Churches of the Valleys of Piedmont, supposing that my reader may easily have recourse to them. Our business is to see what was the faith of these dioceses, and question not but we shall make it appear in the sequel, that those whom the Bishop pretends to convict of Manicheism are falsely charged therewith; the Romish party having bestowed that name upon them, only to make them the more execrable to those of their communion.

Nevertheless, because Ademar Cabannensis testifies, that these Canons of Orleans had been instructed, not by a woman come from Italy, as their history records the story, but by a country fellow (as some MS. copies of Ademar tell us) of Perigueux, I am not unwilling to inquire a little into the authority of this history. Glaber relates it, 50. 3. c. 8. p. 308; but besides his relation, D'Achery hath given us, though not the very acts of the Synod that condemned them, but the account of a private man of Chartres, who professeth that he set down in writing what passed in that Synod, which seems to be of sufficient authority. Be it as it will, they suppose from these proofs, that these Canons were Manichees, and I own they are very like them, in the relation that is given of this Synod, as well as in Ademar.

But yet, after all, there are several things which seem to give us ground to doubt of the truth of this whole relation.

First, It scarcely seems probable, that a woman, who was a stranger or a peasant, should have been able in so short a time to make so many proselytes amongst the canons and citizens of Orleans, as to be able to form secret conventicles amongst them, and to propagate such monstrous doctrines as those of the Manichees were. Neither can we, with any appearance of reason, suppose, that one of these Canons, who formerly had been Confessor to the Queen, was so stupid a fellow, as all on a sudden to fall into the enthusiasm of the Manichees.

Secondly, It is evident, that in perusing these pretended acts, we find that all the witnesses which are produced against them are reducible to one only, and he too of no credit, because himself had been engaged once of their communion. I say all their proceedings were founded upon the depositions of one single man; and then afterwards they make the men, once executed, speak what they please. It will be objected perhaps, that the interrogatories were made in public, in the presence of the people; but then let us consider, that all this was writ after the death of Robert, to justify so bloody an execution.

Thirdly, We do not find in these acts the same accusations; one accuseth them of one thing, and another of another; though it be evident that the design of all these authors is equally to defame them, and make them execrable.

Fourthly, We find in those acts, that these pretended Manichees justify themselves against the capital accusations of Manicheism, chiefly upon the article of the Creation.

Fifthly, We find that they expressed at their martyrdom a hope directly opposite to the principles of Manicheism.

Sixthly, Their very enemies themselves are obliged to give them a most illustrious testimony, as to the sanctity of their lives and manners.

It is certain that the accusing them of denying transubstantiation, and rejecting Baptism, cannot justly be looked upon as a badge of Manicheism, if we consider on the one hand, that the question, whether the bread be changed into the body of Jesus Christ, hath no relation to the doctrine of the Manichees, but respects only those novel doctrines which Paschasius had introduced: and on the other hand, that the Church of Rome accuseth all those for being enemies to Baptism, who in that point do not espouse all the opinions she teacheth, in holding, as she did at that time, the absolute necessity of that sacrament.

And as for their being charged with celebrating horrible festivals, full of incest and abominations, we know that the same hath been imputed to some heretics of old, but falsely. It was laid to the charge also of the Waldenses, but was never proved to be other than a mere calumny: our first reformers have been accused of the same, but with an impudence for which the Church of Rome ought still to blush, if that were a possible thing.

In a word, I find nothing in all this relation that makes it look probable, but only two or three characters which agree with the barbarous maxims of the Church of Rome. The first is, that it attributes to Queen Constance an unusual action, that with a stick she put out the eye of Stephen, who had been her Confessor. The second is an action, much resembling the course that is taken nowadays to surprise heretics, and to discover them; for according to the practice of the Inquisition, we cannot find fault with the method made use of by this Arefastus, who feigned himself willing to become a Manichee, that he might the better discover their opinions. It seems this casuist of Chartres had not much studied St. Paul, who tells us, We ought not to do evil, that good may come of it. The third is, the manner of their taking up the dead body of Theodatus, the Canon, out of his grave, who died three years before, and examining it by the trial of water, that they might be certain whether he was an heretic when he was alive. This is an action well becoming this barbarous age, very like the Inquisitors; and accordingly this was the compendious method which St. Peter of Luxemburg put in practice for the trial and discerning of heretics. I do not remember ever to have read any thing that might authorize this barbarous and extravagant custom, save only the second Canon of the second Council of Sarragossa, held in the year 592, where it is ordained, That the relics which should be found in the churches that had been possessed by the Arians, should be carried to the Bishop, that he might try them by fire. The Bishop of Meaux might have been as sensible of most of these things as we, in perusing these acts; and then it would have been easy for him to judge whether the authority of Vignier, who simply relates what he met with in historians, did deserve to be pressed against us. But it seems it was enough for him to delude his reader, and the name of Vignier (though otherwise he does not accuse these persons of Manicheism) seemed to make for his purpose.

But whatsoever judgment a prudent reader may pass on this accusation of Manicheism, upon which these Canons of Orleans were burnt in the year 1017, it will be easy for us to shew, that the dioceses of Narbon and Aquitain, where some of those eastern Manichees took refuge, did never quit the faith or worship of their ancestors. This is what we shall easily make out in the sequel of this discourse.

Ademarus, a Monk of St. Eparque, at Limoges, hath writ a chronicle from the beginning of the French monarchy until the year 1030, wherein he informs us what was the faith of the Churches of Aquitain at the beginning of the eleventh century.

1. He relates, without passing any censure upon it, the synod held at Gentilly, under Pepin, about images that are set up in churches, and shews that the Bishops of Aquitaine assisted at the same, and that they opposed themselves to the Church of Rome and to the Greeks.

2. Though he grossly mistakes in his chronology about the age of Bede, yet he makes it plain enough who they were whom he looked upon as the preservers of the true theology. He makes this encomium of Rabanus;

"A most learned Monk, the master of Alcuinus; for Bede taught Simplicius, and Simplicius Rabanus, (whom the Emperor Charles sent for from beyond sea, and made a Bishop in France,) who instructed Alcuinus, and Alcuinus informed Smaragdus, Smaragdus again taught Theodulphus of Orleans, and Theodulphus, Elias a Scotchman, Bishop of Angoulesm; this Elias instructed Heiricus, and Heiricus left two Monks, Remigius and Vebaldus, surnamed the Bald, his heirs in philosophy."

This is a most convincing proof of the judgment of the Churches of Aquitaine, concerning the controversies that Paschasius had kindled.

1. We find here that they followed the opinions of Bede, whose Homilies Paulus Diaconus had inserted in his collection, for the use of the Pastors of Gaul, together with those of St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostom, St. Augustin, St. Maximus, and several others. Now the opinions of Bede are diametrically opposite to those of the Church of Rome. This has been formerly proved by a vast number of passages. I shall content myself with setting down one or two of them: the first is upon the third Psalm, where he extols the patience of our Savior to Judas, because he did not exclude him from his most holy supper; wherein, saith he, he delivered the figure of his most sacred body and blood to his disciples. The second is upon the Evangelists, in that part of them which speaks of the institution of that sacrament, where he declares, that because bread strengthens the body, and wine produceth blood in the flesh, the bread is mystically referred to the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine to his blood.

2. They followed Alcuinus's notions, who had a great hand in all the writings of Charlemain, and especially in that concerning images, where we find also his judgment concerning the Eucharist, opposite to that of Paschasius.

3. We find they followed the opinions of Theodulphus, Bishop of Orleans, in whom we see a hundred things that are contrary to the opinions of the present Church of Rome.

4. They followed the opinions of Rabanus Maurus, whom Abbot Herigerus has cried down, for maintaining, that the eucharistical body of Jesus Christ goes to the draught, together with our other food; and whom one Waldensis, in his epistle to Martin, placeth with Heribaldus, amongst the number of those heretics who have dishonored Germany.

5. Ademar proves, beyond contest, that they did not adore the Eucharist in their communion; when on the one hand, speaking of those of Narbon, he saith,

"That to prepare themselves to oppose the Moors of Corduba, who had invaded their coasts, they received the Eucharist at the hands of their Priests, without mentioning any adoration paid to the Sacrament, in so extreme and threatening a danger:" and on the other, speaking of the death of Earl William; "Whereupon," saith he, "the Earl accepting of the penance laid upon him by the Bishops and Abbots, and disposing of all his goods, and particularly bequeathing his estate and honor amongst his sons and his wife; he was reconciled and absolved, and the whole time of Lent frequented Mass and divine worship, till the week before Easter, when after he had received the holy oil and viaticum, and adored and kissed the cross, he yielded up the ghost in the hands of the Bishop of Roan and his Priests, after a very laudable manner."

It is a thing singular and observable, that this Earl pays his adoration to the cross, though at the same time he forgets to worship the Sacrament, which yet is the chief object of adoration. Moreover, we are to observe, that the Latin word adorare, when spoken of the cross, imports only a reverence which we own

was practiced on these occasions long before this time, because the cross being no image, there was no fear of incurring the sin of idolatry in saluting of it. This Count died in the year 1028.

But since this eleventh century was in a manner wholly taken up by the Papists, in opposing Berengarius, who, upon several attacks maintained the interest of truth against Paschasius and his followers; it will be our business to represent how far these disputes were serviceable in hindering the opinions of Paschasius from getting the upper hand in the dioceses of Aquitain and Narbon, and how this prepared their minds for a separation from the Church of Rome.

Never was any man so often condemned as Berengarius, never was any man more backed than he, nor ever did any man give more trouble to those who endeavored to crush him, than he did. An author of the twelfth century hath writ a book, Concerning Berengarius's manifold Condemnation; and Mabillon hath taken care to collect the names and the times of all those assemblies wherein he was condemned; but withal we may assert, that the reasons and authorities he produced, gave his enemies a terrible deal of trouble. His adversaries have employed their utmost efforts to abolish the memory of his works; but a sufficient part of them have been preserved by their own care, to enable us to judge of the injustice of their calumnies against him, and of the purity of his faith in the matter of the Eucharist. And forasmuch as he was of considerable use to the Albigenses, in their opposing of the doctrine of the carnal presence, which the faction of Paschasius and his followers endeavored to introduce and establish under the shelter and favor of that gross ignorance which reigned at this time, I suppose I may affirm, that his works, whereof Lanfrank hath given us an extract, were of no small service to oblige those who undertook his defense, to separate themselves from the communion of the Pope, or rather to hinder him from subjecting them to his yoke; seeing it was at this very time that the Popes began to make themselves masters of the Churches of the west.

It will be of great moment to prove, that the Popes had not as yet made themselves absolute masters of this part of the Church, which was always careful to maintain its rights against their encroachments and usurpations. My intent, therefore, is to employ the following chapter upon this subject, before I proceed to inquire how the faith was preserved in these dioceses in the next age, when they refused to submit themselves to the authority of the Popes of Rome.

CHAPTER 12

That these dioceses continued independent of the Popes, until the beginning of the twelfth century.

I acknowledge, that were the business to be decided by the modern pretensions of the Popes of Rome to the empire of all the Churches of the world, and in particular to a patriarchate over all the Churches of the west, we should be forced to own, that they had been subject to them ever since the time that the Gospel was first preached in Gaul, in both these respects. They have made it their business to persuade mankind, that the whole world is but the Pope's parish; and that more particularly the Churches of the west, which have been founded by their ancestors, who sent them the first preachers of the Gospel, do belong to their patriarchate; as if these envoys of the ancient Popes, in their endeavours to propagate the Gospel of Jesus Christ throughout the world, had designed to establish the Papal empire over all the new conquests that they acquired to the kingdom of Jesus Christ.

But notwithstanding all these new-found claims and pretensions of the Popes, we can prove, that nothing can be imagined more vain, or more destitute of any ground or foundation, than they are. For it is not true that those Churches, which have received the Gospel from another, are therefore subject to it, as we can demonstratively evince by the examples of the Churches of Vienna and Lyons, which were founded by persons sent from the Churches of Asia; upon which account it was, that St. Irenaeus sent them a relation of the persecution they suffered. Neither is it true, that the ancient Popes, how careful soever otherwise they might be to promote their own authority, did ever pretend to be the Patriarchs of all the west, or of Gaul in particular.

This is a truth we can unanswerably prove, by the testimony of the first Council of Nice, which assigns no other jurisdiction to the Pope, save that which he enjoyed in those which Rufinus calls the suburbicarian regions, and which the learned men of the Church of Rome at present own to have been comprehended within the ten provinces of Italy, to which the Papal ordination did belong, as we see it was under Honorius, and which were distinguished from the diocese of Italy, properly so called, that is to say, the seven provinces which constituted the diocese of Milan. This canon therefore looks upon it as a thing not to be questioned, that Gaul was a diocese distinct from that of the Popes, having its authority within itself, governed by its own synods, without having the ordination of its Clergy, the determination of its affairs, or the authority of its assemblies, subjected to the Pope's authority as their superior.

If we had not this canon of the first Council of Nice, which distinctly determines the Pope's diocese, yet would it be very easy to prove it by other arguments, such as these:

1. We find, that the Churches of Gaul convoked a synod, upon the contest about Easter, towards the end of the second century, without receiving any orders from Pope Victor for so doing.

2. We find, that when the Donatists were condemned by the Pope, they desired the Emperor that they might be judged by the Bishops of Gaul: and accordingly we find that Marinus, Bishop of Arles, presided in the great Council of Arles in the year 314, at which were present eighty-three Bishops, twenty-one of Italy, eleven of Spain, eleven of Africa, five of Britain, and thirty-five of Gaul.

Since the Council of Nice, we find the Churches of Gaul governing themselves with the same independency, under the conduct of their several Metropolitans.

We are to observe in general, that these Churches had their peculiar code of canons, made by themselves, and that these canons continued to have the force of a law till the eighth century, when their discipline began to receive a great alteration, by the cares of Bonifacius, Bishop of Mentz, and his successors. This is amply proved by Justel, in the preface to his collection of the ancient canons. Now it is visible, that a

Church which had its particular rules could not be dependent on the Pope, whose diocese had its own particular rules and canons.

We can truly affirm, that the Bishops of Gaul were so far from acknowledging the Pope as their Patriarch, that his name was not so much as ever recited in the Churches of Gaul till the year 529, as may be clearly collected from the Council of Vaison; where it was first determined, that the Pope should be mentioned in their public prayers.

And indeed if we inquire into the constant conduct of the Bishops of Gaul, throughout the several centuries that are past since the Council of Nice, we shall easily perceive, that they never conceived themselves to be subject to the Pope of Rome.

In the year 337, Maximinus, Bishop of Triers, defends St. Athanasius, as Pope Julius also did, and admits to his communion Paul, Bishop of Constantinople, and writes in favor of him to the Council of Sardica. In 356, Saturninus, Bishop of Arles, convened the Council of Beziers, which condemned St. Hilary, of Poitiers, in consequence of which he was sent into banishment.

In 358, the Bishops of Gaul condemned the confession of faith of Sirmium, as we are informed by Sulpicius Severus.

In the year 360, St. Hilary vigorously defended the faith against the Arian party, in favor of which Pope Liberius had declared himself; and it is well known what anathemas were discharged in Gaul by St. Hilary and his friends, against that apostate Pope.

Pope Leo was so fully convinced of their authority as independent upon his, that he sent to them in the year 450 that dogmatical epistle which he was to send to the east, as soon as the synods of Gaul had approved of it. And it was upon the same account that he sent them the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon against the Eutychians.

In the sixth century we find Avitus, Bishop of Vienna, using his utmost endeavors to appease the differences between the Church of Rome and that of Constantinople.

We find likewise Pope Hormisdas communicating to the Bishops of Gaul his reconciliation with the Patriarchs of Constantinople.

We find in 529 the Fathers of the Council of Orange handling the questions about grace, and sending their decrees to Boniface II. who approved them the year following.

In 550 Pope Vigilius gives an account to the Churches of Gaul, of what had passed in the East; and the Prelates of Italy entreat the Bishops of Gaul, to endeavor to appease Justinian in favor of Vigilius and Dacius Bishop of Milan.

In the seventh century we find, that the Gallican Bishops confirmed the Lateran Council that was assembled under Martin I.

We find Pope Agatho inviting the Bishops of Gaul to come to a council that he intended to call, whither also they sent their deputies at his request.

The eighth century being in a manner wholly spent in wars, affords us little or nothing considerable in this matter; however, we may easily discern that this diocese did even then maintain its authority, in spite of all the Popes endeavors to the contrary: whereof we have two most evident instances. First, Pope Adrian I. was so little informed of what passed in France, that he knew not whether the city of Bourges was subject to the jurisdiction of another Archbishop or no; as appears from the Codex Carolinus, Epist. 87. Secondly, Their independency clearly appears from the several councils assembled about the controversy of images, contrary to the designs of the Popes, and particularly from the Council of Francfort.

We find the same spirit also in the following century. And to speak truth, whatever change the ancient discipline underwent by occasion of the new decretals which the Pope's emissaries had published, in order to subjugate all the west, and France in particular; yet we find that the Bishops of France hindered the Popes from concerning themselves with their affairs: the business of Hincmar of Laon alone evidently shews, that they did not acknowledge that new right, invented to make them buckle to the Papal yoke; for we see that they maintained, that the determinations of their synods were not to be altered by the Popes, they having no power to concern themselves about their ordination, or any part of their jurisdiction. About the end of the tenth century, in the year 991, we find the Bishops of France that were assembled at Rheims, maintaining themselves by the canons of the African Code, in opposing the Pope's encroachments, who would, in pursuance of those spurious decretals of the ancient Popes, arrogate to himself a right of reviewing and altering the determinations that were made by the synods of France.

I own, that since the middle of the fifth century, we find the Popes granted a kind of vicarship to some of the Bishops of South Gaul; but withal, we know that this power was so extremely wavering, that it stood in need of being confirmed at the instance of Leo I. by the Emperor Valentinian III. Secondly, That these were in a manner of no efficacy at all, these Vicars having scarcely had the power of convening synods, but in virtue of the right they had as they were Metropolitans, and little or no authority as to the ordination of Bishops in general, and of Metropolitans in particular. It cannot be denied also, but that the Popes, since the eighth century, began to grant divers privileges, to the violating of the ancient discipline, though under the pretense of preserving it in the monasteries, against the attempts of the Bishops, because most of the Bishops, being turned soldiers, thought of nothing else but robbing them, under color of holding their visitations. But it is worth our while to consider the esteem that Hincmar, of Rheims, had of these sort of privileges, in his letter to Nicholas I.

"Now I did not," saith he, "desire the privileges of the apostolical see, as supposing that the holy canons and decrees, which the Church of Rome grants to every Metropolitan, were not sufficient; neither did I nor do I desire any other or ampler privileges, than what have been formerly granted to the Church of Rheims; but because not only my diocese, but also my province, is divided between two kingdoms, belonging to two several kings; and because the concerns of the Church, committed to my charge, seem to lie under the jurisdiction of several princes, from whom our Church can reap little or no advantage; because the ancient constitutions being already condemned by some carnal and brutal men, they might at least be frightened by these new decretals into a more reverential carriage towards the Church, which is committed to the care of me, though unworthy."

From whence we may see what it was that Hincmar meant. We may make the same reflection upon those vicarships aforementioned: we have an illustrious example to this purpose in the case of Ansegisus, Archbishop of Sens, 11. kalend. July, indiction 9.

"After the Bishops were met together, and the Gospels were read before the synod, and in view of the imperial throne, (which were afterwards laid up at Pontyon,) the Emperor Charles came with the legates of the apostolical see, and after the singing of several hymns, and a prayer pronounced by John, Bishop of Tusculanum, the Emperor took his seat in the synod. After which, John, the Bishop of Tusculanum, read some letters sent from the Pope, and amongst them one, recommending to them Ansegisus, Archbishop of Sens, for their Primate; that as oft as the interest of the Church should require it, either in calling of synods, or in the managing of other concerns in France and Germany, he might be looked upon as the apostolical Vicar; and so by his means the decrees of the apostolical see might be made known to the Bishops; and on the other hand, that any matters of importance might by him be communicated to the apostolic see, and that all affairs of moment and difficulty might, by his suggestion, be recommended to the apostolic see, to be cleared and determined. Whereupon the Emperor demanded of the Bishops, what answer they designed to return to these apostolical letters: who answered to this effect, that saving the right and privileges of each Metropolitan, according to the sacred canons, and the decrees of the Popes of the see of Rome, promulged from the said sacred canons, they would obey the apostolical commands of Pope John. And when the Emperor and the apostolical legates had done their utmost endeavors to persuade the Bishops to an absolute answer, that they would obey without reserve, in accepting of Ansegisus for their Primate, as the Pope had written, yet could they never draw from them any other answer. Then the Emperor commanded a chair to be set above all the Bishops of his Cisalpine kingdom, next to John, Bishop of Tusculanum, who sat at his right hand, and commanded Ansegisus to take place of all the Bishops that had been ordained

before him, and to sit down in that chair; the Archbishop of Rheims protesting against it in the hearing of them all, as a thing directly contrary to the sacred canons. In like manner, the day before the ides of July, the same letter concerning the primacy of Ansegisus was read a second time at the Emperor's command, and the Bishops answer demanded thereupon. Whereupon the Archbishops answered severally for themselves, that as their predecessors had been regularly obedient to his predecessors, so would they be to his decrees. So likewise, at the command of the apostolical legates, that the Bishops should meet the 17th day before the kalends of August; the Emperor entered the synod at nine o'clock in the morning -- being accompanied by the apostolical legates - and all took their places as before. Then Johannes Aretinus read a certain paper, which had neither reason nor authority. Afterwards Odo, Bishop of Beauvais, read some articles set down by the apostolical legates, and by Ansegisus and Odo, without the knowledge of the synod, between - - containing nothing to the purpose; and besides, void of all reason and authority, which for that reason are not here added. And then again a motion was made concerning the primacy of Ansegisus, who, after all, could obtain no more this last time than he did at the first day of the synod."

From which account it is most evident, that notwithstanding all the pains Charles the Bald took to oblige the Pope, whose friendship he had occasion for, and whose ambition he maintained by trampling upon the ecclesiastical laws, and the rights of the Prelates of France; yet the Bishops continued firm in their judgments, and would not suffer themselves to be enslaved, as the Pope would fain have had them. This happened in the year 876.

In particular, we may justly observe concerning these parts where the Albigenses have appeared with the greatest lustre. First, That the greatest part of these dioceses, being rent off from the empire after the year 409, when Alaric made Tholouse the seat of the kingdom of the Visi-Goths, it continued so divided till it was again reduced under the power of the French, by Clovis, in the year of our Lord 507. Secondly, That since that time, we find that these parts of France have been almost always united with the Churches of Spain, as appears from the subscriptions of the synods held in Spain. Thirdly, That they were never, to speak properly, reunited with the body of the Churches of France, till the reign of the Emperor Charlemain. Fourthly, That the power of the Popes in France hath been so very inconsiderable, that a legate of the Pope, having undertaken to consecrate a chapel in Anjou by the Duke's order, but without consent of the Bishop, Radulphus Glaber, who relates this history, could not forbear exclaiming against this encroachment: Baronius, on the other hand, storms against Glaber, but the one of them writ what those of his time thought and spoke concerning it; whereas the other gave himself entirely up to the power of prejudice, and followed the design he had undertaken of accommodating ancient history with the interest of the court of Rome, on which he had his dependance.

But we are especially to observe, that the Popes never began to exercise their absolute power there, till they had settled their legates in those parts, and had brought all causes to be tried at their tribunal. Thus Paschal II. appointed Girard, Bishop of Angoulesm, to be his Vicar in the provinces of Bourges, Bourdeaux, Tours, and Britain, in the year 1107, as appears by the commission granted by Paschal II. to Girard, Bishop of Angoulesm, published by D'Achery.

Thus the legantine power, in the diocese of Auch, was given after the year 1102, to William, Archbishop of Auch, as De Marca shews, on the Council of Clermont.

What I have just now observed is so certain, that Mezeray hath publicly owned it in his Chronological Abridgment. From the time of the eighth century, the Popes found ways to lessen the power of Metropolitans, by obliging them by the decree of a Council held at Mentz by St. Boniface, which forced them to receive the Pallium at Rome, and to subject themselves, and be canonically obedient in all points to the Church of Rome; which profession was afterwards changed into an oath of fidelity under Gregory VII. They also attributed to themselves, excluding all others, the power of annulling the spiritual marriage which a Bishop contracts with his church, and to give him the liberty to espouse another. They had extended their patriarchal jurisdiction all over the west, by obliging the Bishops to take confirmation from them, for which they paid certain dues, which, in process of time, were changed into what they called annates, and by taking cognizance of those things which belonged to the Bishops only. Nay, what is more, they had in a manner wholly abolished the provincial councils, in taking away their sovereignty, by annulling of their decrees; so that these assemblies were at last wholly left off as useless, because they afforded nothing to those who assisted at them, save the displeasure of frequently seeing their determinations made

void at Rome, without once hearing their reasons. Gregory VII. established it for a rule of common right, that nobody should dare to condemn any person who had appealed to the holy see. But they never made a greater breach upon the liberties of the Gallican Church, than when they introduced this opinion, that no council could be assembled without their authority; and when, after several attempts to establish perpetual Vicars in Gaul, they found the way of having their legates received there. To this purpose they first made use of a canon of the Council of Sardica, which gave them power to send legates into the provinces, to examine the processes and the depositions of any Bishops, in cases where any complaint was made. After that they had thus accustomed the French Bishops to admit their legates in this case, they by little and little gained another point, when the princes were weak, which was to send some amongst them without any complaint or appeal at all; and at last, after they had submitted to the yoke, Alexander II. established it as a rule, that the Pope ought to have the government and administration of all Churches.

Of these legates, some had a whole kingdom under their jurisdiction, others some part only: they came thither with full power to depose Bishops, yea, the Metropolitan himself, whenever they pleased to assemble the councils of their district, and to preside therein with the Metropolitan; but taking place of him, to make canons, to send the decision of those matters to the Pope, to which the Bishops would not give their consent, as likewise all the acts of the council, whereof he disposed at his will and pleasure. And it is to be observed, that their suffrages outweighed those of all the Bishops together, and that oftentimes by their simple authority they judged and determined the causes of the elections of Bishops, of benefices, of the excommunications of laymen, and the like. Insomuch, that these assemblies, which before were so sacred and so sovereign, for the supporting and maintaining of discipline, having no power any longer, were, to speak properly, rather councils to authorize and ratify the will and pleasure of the Pope, than any lawful or free councils.

So that it was not till the Papacy of Alexander II. and Gregory VII. that the Churches of Aquitain saw themselves in danger of losing their liberty, by submitting to the Papal yoke, as well as the rest of the French Churches. We are now to see how they avoided this yoke, which was thus imposed upon them in some measure.

CHAPTER 13

Of the opposition that was made by a part of these Churches to the attempts of the Popes, and of their separation from the communion of Rome before Peter Waldo.

It is difficult precisely to set down the year wherein a considerable part of these dioceses rejected the power of the Pope's legates, and loudly condemned the errors which they would have introduced under the name of councils, which the Popes had so often assembled against Berengarius. But we have great reason to conclude, that it happened under Gregory VII. when he undertook to oblige the Bishops of France to swear an oath of fidelity to him, in much a like form as vassals swear to the lords of the fee; for in reality it is the very same. This strange piece of novelty, which at one blow destroyed all the rights of the Church, excited both pastors and people to defend their liberties, and to reject this imperious yoke. Then it was also, that he endeavoured to change the common service of the Church, by striking out all that was not agreeable to the Roman service, which was very proper to inflame the minds of the people, and make them more watchful for the preservation of the doctrine and ceremonies of religion, which they had received from their ancestors.

For instance, it is certain that in the eleventh century they changed the collects which concerned the prayer for the dead. We have an example of it that was inserted in the decretal of Gregory IX. It is an answer of Innocent III. to John de Beauxmains, Archbishop of Lyons, who at that time was retired in the abbey of Clairvaux. It contains the question which that Archbishop, who was the persecutor and condemner of Peter Waldo, propounds to Innocent III. together with the Pope's answer.

"Your brothership has inquired why there was a change made in the service of Saint Leo; so that whereas the ancient books express the prayer thus, Grant to us, Lord, that this offering may be of advantage to the soul of thy servant Leo; in the modern books it is expressed thus, Grant to us, O Lord, we beseech thee, that by the intercession of St. Leo this offering may be of advantage to us?"

"To which we answer, saith the Pope, that since the authority of Scripture assures us, that he doth an injury to a martyr, who prays for a martyr, we are by a parity of reason to judge the same of other saints, because they need not our prayers, as being perfectly happy, and enjoying all things according to their wishes: but it is we rather that stand in need of their prayers, who being miserable, are in continual trouble, by reason of the evils that surround us. Wherefore such expressions as these, that such an offering may be of advantage to this or that saint, for their glory and honor, which we meet with in most prayers, are thus to be understood, that it may conduce to this end, that he may be more and more glorified by the faithful here on earth. Though most suppose it a thing not unworthy of the saints, to assert that their glory is continually increased until the day of judgment; and therefore that the Church may in the mean time lawfully wish for the increase of their glorification. But whether in this point that distinction may take place, which teacheth us, that of those who are dead some are very good, others very bad, others indifferently good, and others indifferently bad; and therefore whether the suffrages of believers in the Church for the very good are thanksgiving; for the very bad, comforts to the living; for those who are indifferently good, expiations; and for the indifferently bad, propitiations; I leave to your prudence to require."

Moreover, the Popes, Nicholas II. and his successors, undertook to defend the celibacy of the Clergy, by which means a great many Pastors were deprived of the functions of their ministry, which obliged also a vast number of them to separate themselves from the communion of the Pope, whose creatures, after the decree was passed for authorizing celibacy, looked upon the married Clergy to be no more than simple laymen; not to mention now that the multiplicity of schisms and Antipopes had reduced most of the dioceses of France into a strange confusion; some holding for one Pope, others for another.

But though we cannot assign the precise epocha of the beginning of this courageous opposition to the see of Rome, which had no other original but the just defense of their liberties, and the desire of preserving their

ancient truths; yet thus much seems to be certain, as far as we can gather from the poor remainder of records which the barbarity of the Inquisitors hath suffered to come down to us:

1. That this public opposition against the efforts of Popery was made about the beginning of the twelfth century.
2. That without great ignorance, both in history and chronology, it cannot be supposed that the Albigenses were the disciples of Peter Waldo, and that consequently they are to be looked upon as a colony of the Vaudois.

It is necessary that we prove both these articles with the greatest clearness that may be; as well, on the one hand, to make it appear that the Bishop of Meaux hath no ground to suppose that these dioceses were peaceably united to the Church of Rome, and in dependence upon it, before the Albigenses appeared amongst them; and on the other hand, to disabuse some of our own people, who too lightly have believed, because the Albigenses are esteemed by some to be the same with the Vaudois, that they borrowed their light from Peter Waldo.

The first article can be very solidly proved by an argument which seems beyond all exception; I observe therefore, that Radulphus, Abbot of Tron, about the year 1125, would not return from Italy through the southern parts of France, *audiebat pollutam esse inveterata haeresi de corpore et sanguine Domini*, "because he heard they were polluted with an inveterate heresy concerning the body and blood of our Lord."

We see clearly that the heresy that reigned in these dioceses was that of Berengarius, who had bestowed the title of Mystical Babylon upon the Church of Rome, and not that of the Manichees. This passage of Radulphus of Tron agrees perfectly with what Petrus Cluniacensis, and Baronius after him, tell us, that Peter de Bruis had preached in the diocese of Arles about the beginning of the twelfth century. Now it is ridiculous to suppose that one can declare a country to be infected with an inveterate heresy, except there be great numbers of men who publicly profess it. True it is, that they bestow the name of *Petrobusians* upon the disciples of Peter de Bruis, as if he had been the author of that sect; but this doth not overthrow what we have said, and only shews that the Papists are usually ready to bestow upon the disciples the name of their masters, thereby to reflect upon them as innovators. Thus they called the followers of Berengarius *Berengarians*, as if he had been an innovator, who indeed took upon him the defense of the old notions against the innovations of Paschasius Radbertus. In like manner, they called those *Henricians*, who followed the doctrine of Henry, who yet followed and preached the doctrine of Peter de Bruis and Berengarius; so that it doth not follow from thence, that Henry was the first that ever preached that doctrine. Thus afterwards they gave the name of *Esperonites* to the disciples of Esperonus, as if he had been the first author of that sect. And is not this very conformable to that ancient method, whereby Lindanus, Bishop of Ruremonde, made as many heads of the Reformation as there were men of note that had a hand in that great work? A different method, or the least article wherein they did not agree with their brethren, serving him for a sufficient pretense to make them so many different heads of distinct parties.

The proofs I am about to produce in confirmation of the second article do no less shew the truth of what I have laid down, that these dioceses had a long time since a great number of people and pastors, who were of different opinions from those of the Church of Rome. I do acknowledge that, towards the end of the twelfth century, there may have been some of the disciples of Peter Waldo in these dioceses of Aquitain and Narbon; which has occasioned that several Popish writers have almost persuaded some Protestants that the Waldenses were the authors of the Reformation amongst the Albigenses. Perrin takes it for granted in the beginning of his History, which he was the more easily persuaded to believe, since he had observed that the Albigenses have maintained the same faith with the Waldenses.

But it is not true that the Waldenses ever carried their faith into these countries, but they found it there already established, and they joined themselves to those who defended the same, before ever any of Waldo's disciples came thither to seek refuge for themselves.

This is a matter of fact which it is easy to prove beyond controversy; for seeing that St. Bernard was in that country in the year 1147, to preach there, and that he made but small progress in it, (so firmly were they

grounded in their faith,) we must necessarily infer from hence, that they had for a long time been engaged in the same. And indeed it appears from the manner of St. Bernard's expressing himself in his Sermons, and in his Epistle to the Count of St. Gilles, that these opinions, so opposite to those of the Church of Rome, had of a long time been entertained in these countries.

We have the fourth canon of the Council of Tours in the year 1163, which declares the antiquity of this pretended heresy in Gascoin and the country about Tholouse, and speaks of their meetings, which the title of the canon justly refers to the Albigenses, in these words;

"In the country about Tholouse, there sprung up long ago a damnable heresy, which by little and little, like a cancer, spreading itself to the neighboring places in Gascoin, hath already infected many other provinces; which, whilst, like a serpent, it hid itself in its own windings and twinings, crept on more secretly, and threatened more danger to the simple and unwary. Wherefore we do command all Bishops and Priests, dwelling in these parts, to keep a watchful eye upon these heretics, and, under the pain of excommunication, to forbid all persons, as soon as these heretics are discovered, from presuming to afford them any abode in their country, or to lend them any assistance, or to entertain any commerce with them in buying or selling; that so at least, by the loss of the advantages of human society, they may be compelled to repent of the error of their life. And if any prince, making himself partaker of their iniquity, shall endeavor to oppose these decrees, let him be struck with the same anathema. And if they shall be seized by any Catholic princes, and cast into prison, let them be punished by confiscation of all their goods: and because they frequently come together from divers parts into one hiding-place; and because they have no other ground for their dwelling together, save only their agreement and consent in error; therefore we will, that such their conventicles be both diligently searched after, and when they are found, that they be examined according to canonical severity."

This canon expressly declares, first, That this pretended heresy had appeared a long time before. Secondly, That it had infected several provinces of these dioceses. Thirdly, That most severe methods were made use of to reduce them. This appears by the Council of Lateran, in the year 1179, in the last chapter. And it is plain also from the letters of the Archbishop of Narbon to King Lewis VII.

"My Lord the King, we are extremely pressed with many calamities, amongst which there is one that most of all affects us, which is, that the Catholic faith is extremely shaken in this our diocese, and St. Peter's boat is so violently tossed by the waves, that it is in great danger of sinking."

Now, since Lewis VII. died in the year 1180, having reigned ever since the year 1137, it appears clearly, that Languedoc was full of the disciples of Peter de Bruis and Henry, a long time before ever Waldo or any of his disciples had begun to preach.

We may gather the same from what is related by Henry, Abbot of Clairvaux, in the Annals of Hoveden, anno 1178, where he saith, That this plague was come to such a head in that country, that they had not only made themselves Priests and Popes, but also had their Evangelists. I own that Hoveden seems to suppose that the faith of these Albigenses came from Italy, by his calling them Paterines; for as for the name of Publicans, it was like that of Cathari, given them on purpose to blacken them, and is the same with that of Bulgarians and Paphlagonians; all relating to the original of the Manichees, who came out of those countries at first.

Thirdly, It appears from the edicts quoted by Hoveden, that they were made against people of a more ancient standing than the disciples of Waldo.

"Wherefore, because the damnable perverseness of those heretics, whom some call Cathari, others Publicans, others Paterines, and others by other names, is increased in Gascoin, the country of Alby, and other places, so far that they do no more now, as in other places, exercise their impiety in private, but manifest their errors publicly."

Stephen of Tournay is an unquestionable witness to the same truth; he wrote a letter to Johannes de Beauxmains, Bishop of Polctiers, in the year 1181, to persuade him to comply with the election of those of

Lyons, who desired him for their Archbishop, and lays before his eyes the notorious infidelity of the dioceses of Languedoc, Gascoin, and Septimania, and the general desolation of the churches of the Romish party in those parts. "Far be it, Father," saith he, "from your clemency, that you should have any inclination for the barbarity of the Goths, the levity of the Gascoins, or for the cruel and savage manners of those of Septimania, where infidelity is above faith, famine above fame, treachery and trouble more than can be conceived. I lately saw in my passage, when the King sent me to Tholouse, a terrible image of death, frequent and fervent in that country, the walls of churches half demolished, sacred buildings half burnt down, their foundations digged up, and where there were formerly the dwellings of men, now nothing but the habitations of beasts. I confess I shaked and trembled when I heard you were invited to those parts, in which, though you might chance to be a Bishop, yet you might easily be so without any advantage."

We have the concurrent testimony of the Archbishops and other Prelates assembled at Lavaur against the Albigenses, who declare in their letters to Innocent III. that this heresy had been sown in these countries long before, in these terms:

"For whereas the heretical pestilence, which of old time hath been sown in those parts, was now grown to that height, that Divine worship was scorned and derided, and the heretics on one hand, and the robbers on the other, harassed the Clergy and the Church's revenue, and that both prince and people, being given over to a reprobate mind, swerved from the true faith; now, by means of your armies, by which you have most wisely designed to purge away the infection and noisomeness of this pestilence, and their most Christian leader, the Earl of Montfort, an undaunted warrior, and unconquered fighter of the Lord's battles, the Church, which was so miserably ruined, begins again to lift up her head; and both enemies and errors being for the most part destroyed, the land which hath so long been wasted by the followers of these opinions, will at length accustom itself again to the worship of God."

Lastly, The same thing appears by the testimony of Peter, a Monk of Veaux Cernay, in the first chapter of his History:

"In the province of Narbon, where formerly the faith flourished, the enemy of the faith has begun to sow his tares. The people there are distasted with the sacraments of Christ, who is the savor and wisdom of God, being become profane and unwise, by forsaking the wisdom of true godliness."

And after having represented how the Monks, Petrus de Castro Novo and Radulphus, the Pope's legates, had forced those of Tholouse to abjure their faith for fear of punishments, but that soon after they returned again to their former opinions; he adds,

"For being perjured, and relapsing into their former calamity, they concealed the heretics that preached at midnight in their conventicles. O how difficult a thing it is to pluck up a deep-rooted custom! This treacherous city of Tholouse, from its very first foundation, (as it is said,) hath seldom or never been clear of this detestable plague; this poison of heretical pravity and superstitious infidelity having been successively diffused from father to son. Wherefore she also, as a due vengeance for so great wickedness, has endured the effects of avenging hands, and the ruin of a just desolation. -- Yea, what is more, she has suffered this heretical nature and home-bred heresy, after it had been driven out by a well-deserved severity, to return again upon her; being desirous to imitate her ancestors, and refusing to degenerate. By the example of whose neighborhood, as one rotten grape taints another, and as a whole herd of swine are infected by the scabbiness of a single hog, so the neighboring cities and towns, having once had these arch-heretics rooted amongst them, are become wonderfully and miserably infected with this plague, by the springing shoots of their infidelity; the Barons of the several lordships in these provinces being almost all of them become the defenders and entertainers of heretics, loving them sincerely, and defending them against God and the Church very warmly."

One needs only to reflect upon what I have here produced concerning the time of the promotion of Johannes de Beauxmains to the archbishopric of Lyons, and to recollect that it was he that persecuted Peter Waldo, to make us acknowledge that we cannot suppose the Albigenses to have been the disciples of this Peter Waldo.

CHAPTER 14

Of the opinions of Peter de Bruis and Henry, and their disciples, and whether they were Manichees, or not.

We find that though some Manichees settled themselves in Languedoc, yet it seems they have only served to give the Papists a color to accuse those whom their errors and their false worship obliged them to look upon as an antichristian Church. This will appear yet more clearly, by the account we are about to give here of the opinions of Peter de Bruis, of Henry, and of their disciples, whom the Bishop of Meaux would willingly have thought to have been Manichees. Baronius was not so quicksighted as the Bishop; but because it happens oft, that those who stand upon the shoulders of a tall man can see a little further than he, we must inquire, by examining this matter carefully, whether we are to believe Baronius or the Bishop of Meaux.

The care of the Inquisition has scarcely left us any record of Peter de Bruis; so that we know scarce any thing of what concerns him, but what we have from the report of his enemies, and those enemies too to that degree, that they used fire and sword to destroy him; which alone is sufficiently a strong presumption, that they had little or no inclination to extenuate the horridness of his opinions, nor to put a reasonable sense upon them, when, according to the rules of equity, they could have given them a good one. Be it as it will, Peter, Abbot of Clugny, bears witness, that Peter de Bruis, from whom the Albigenses have been called Petrobusians, had taught almost twenty years in the dioceses of Arles, Embrun, and in Gascoin, whither the persecution, which he suffered from the Bishops and Archbishops of those dioceses, stirred up against him by Peter de Clugny, had forced him to take refuge. He declares that he had made a great number of disciples, and exhorts these Prelates to oppose themselves against the progress of his doctrine, by forcing him in this his retreat, not only by preaching against him, but also, if it were needful, *vi armata per laicos*, "with armed force by laymen."

These Bishops answered these exhortations of Peter de Clugny perfectly well; so that after they had obliged him to keep more private, they watched him so closely by their votaries, that at last they seized him at St. Gilles, where they caused him to be burnt in the year 1126, to the great satisfaction of Peter de Clugny and of Baronius, who highly extol the zeal of those who by this means had avenged the injury he had done to crosses, in burning them to boil his meat on Good Friday.

This is one of the crimes laid to his charge by Peter de Clugny, a crime of such a nature, that king Hezekiah may upon the same account be looked upon as a most profane person, though we know that his zeal hereto was approved by God himself. At this rate also, John of Jerusalem must be looked upon as a very negligent Prelate for not burning St. Epiphanius, who at Anablatha had torn the hangings of a church in which he found the pictures of Jesus Christ, and of some other saints. And Gregory I. must pass for a negligent ignorant person, for not burning Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, who broke down the church-images, as well as Peter de Bruis, in a time when idolatry was not yet come to its height. For as for his boiling meat with the wood of the cross on Good Friday, and eating of the same, supposing he had indeed done so, (though there be great probability to the contrary, and that it was only one of those slanderous imputations the Monks make use of to stir up the fury of the ignorant rabble,) it would at the most have been no more than a notable action to awaken these idolaters, by setting before them their own Pagan folly, described by the Prophet Isaiah in the 44th chapter of his prophecy.

But this was not the only crime of Peter de Bruis; he was not only an image-breaker, but he had besides, during these twenty years of his ministry, preached up many heresies: the chiefest of which Peter de Clugny reduceth to five articles, as being more horrid than the rest. "And because," saith he, "the first seeds of this erroneous doctrine were sown and propagated by Peter de Bruis for almost twenty years together, they brought forth chiefly five poisonous shoots, against which I opposed myself as much as I was able."

"The first consisted in denying that infants could be saved by baptism, when they are under the age of reason; and that the faith of the parents can be available to those who are not of age to believe."

"The second consisted in maintaining that no temples or churches ought to be built, and that those already built ought to be destroyed; and that Christians did not need holy, that is, consecrated, places to worship God in, etc."

"The third consisted in asserting that they ought to break down and burn the holy crosses, because that figure and that instrument wherewith Jesus Christ had been so cruelly tormented and put to death, was so far from being worthy of adoration, veneration, or any other kind of supplication, that it ought to be dishonored with indignity, broke to pieces and burnt, to revenge our Saviour's torments and his death."

"The fourth consisted, not only in denying the truth of the body and blood of our Lord, which is offered up every day, and continually by the sacrament of the Church; but also in maintaining that it was nothing, and ought not to be offered."

"The fifth consisted in deriding all the offerings, prayers and alms, and other good works done by the faithful that are living, for those that are dead, because they could not by any of these means afford them the least comfort."

These were the heresies which Peter de Bruis had taught for twenty years together, which is time enough to know the opinions of one man. And though Peter de Clugny, by his character of being a Monk, and his mortal enemy, was easily persuaded to indulge his credulity so far as to believe some reports spread abroad concerning the disciples of Peter de Bruis, that they did not own the Old Testament, which put him upon proving the divinity thereof, yet he insisted so little upon it, that he shews he was not persuaded in his conscience that the Petrobusians were Manichees: and the Bishop of Meaux ought to have imitated his discretion in the same matter. But, saith the Bishop, they rejected baptism, which is one of the characters of the Manichees. If he had said that Peter de Bruis had revived the error of the Hieracites, whom St. Epiphanius speaks of, he would have had more reason on his side; for the first article, as Peter de Clugny hath expressed it, comes very near the opinion of the Hieracites: but it is absolutely false, that it agrees with the belief of the Manichees concerning that sacrament. The Manichees absolutely rejected baptism; whereas, if we will believe Peter de Clugny, the Petrobusians did not look upon it as needless, but only to infants. In a word, Peter de Clugny attributes to them a kind of anabaptism, which maintained that infants were not capable of baptism, and that it was only to be conferred upon such as were full grown, because at the receiving of it they were to make profession of their faith for themselves. At this rate we might as well accuse Tertullian, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and Walfridus Strabo, of Manicheism. We shall find hereafter, that this error was not general amongst them, because the disciples of Peter de Bruis and Henry reject it as a slanderous imputation, and because the malice which appears in the wording of this calumny is nothing but the effect of that hatred wherewith Peter de Clugny was inflamed against these pretended heretics.

The second article is visibly nothing else but a consequence drawn from the aversion the Petrobusians had for the Popish churches, because of the idolatries there committed, and of their consecrations to the honor of saints. It is no such strange thing to see men condemn temples to be demolished, which they believe to have been profaned by idolatry. Gregory I. was one of the first that ever consecrated Pagan temples into meeting places for Christians; whereas before, the emperors had ordered them to be shut up, and caused some of them to be pulled down. It is very ordinary for those who detest the idolatry reigning in churches to be desirous to remove all the objects of it at the greatest distance from those whose salvation they endeavor to procure. Lastly, We know that the Petrobusians judged the Pope to be the Antichrist, which might very well prompt them to so great an aversion for these kind of buildings, in which Antichrist had his throne, as St. Hilary of Poitiers had distinctly foretold.

But let men think what they please, this article has nothing of Manicheism in it.

The third heresy of the Petrobusians hath still less of Manicheism than the former. It is evident that this also is nothing but a popular consequence against the worship of the cross, which was then practiced upon diverse occasions, of which we have before seen an example, at the death of a great lord of that country. But

whereas he supposeth that the Petrobusians did acknowledge that Jesus Christ hath endured the cross, and that he died upon it; in so doing he fully acquits them of being Manichees, since they did not own that our Lord Jesus Christ truly died upon the cross.

Moreover it must be confessed, that no man could better have renewed the doctrine of St. Agobardus, than Peter de Bruys, when he maintained that neither veneration, adoration, nor supplication, were due to the cross, and that they were to be broken, in case people were found to bestow any such worship upon them. For this was the doctrine of Agobardus, in his Discourse of Pictures.

The fourth heresy is expressed in very odious terms, and after the Popish manner, who own nothing to be real in the Sacrament, if the flesh of Jesus Christ and his blood be not there in substance, and who do not believe he is present in the Sacrament upon any other account, but as he is offered up to God before he is eaten. But yet here there is nothing in this double article of Manicheism. On the contrary, we may assert that the Romish opinion rather is a branch of Manicheism than theirs: for is not the body of Jesus Christ in the bread? and doth not the substance of the bread become the substance of Jesus Christ? and the Priest, or the faithful, when they digest it, do they not restore the body of Christ to liberty, in freeing it of its bonds, by which the charm of consecration tied it up?

The act of oblation which the Petrobusians blamed in the Mass, is more clearly explained by their disciples, as we shall see hereafter. In the mean time, it is worth observing, that they opposed the change which then began to be made in the Church of Rome, and which being accomplished, produced that addition in the Liturgy, where they make the Priest say, *et pro quibus tibi offerimus*, "and for whom we offer up to thee;"

whereas before the whole offering respected only the people, *qui tibi offerunt*, "who offer up unto thee,"

in allusion to that custom of the people's offering the bread and wine which was used at the communion. As soon as the faith of the real presence was once entertained, they presently inquired what use might be made of it; and they found that it might be offered up to God, before it was offered to the people: and when they were once confirmed in the belief of this custom, they found it was necessary for the Priest to express a sacerdotal act; whereas therefore the people before simply offered the bread and wine to God, in order to celebrate the communion with it, after consecration they thought good to substitute the Priest's offering of them up for the people. This was more distinctly practiced in the thirteenth century, as Menardus the Benedictine informs us in his Discourse upon the Sacramentarium of St. Gregory, though before that time we find some footsteps of this opinion.

The fifth article, which rejects purgatory, and maintains that the living cannot help the deceased believers by their prayers, alms, or good works, nor by any masses designedly said for them, has as little Manicheism as the former: for as the Petrobusians cannot be said to be Manichees for condemning the use of infant baptism, so neither can they be esteemed Manichees for denying purgatory and prayers for the dead. Let the Bishop of Meaux turn over as long as he pleaseth the catalogue of heresies, he will nowhere be able to find that the rejecting of purgatory, and prayers for the dead, are characters of Manicheism.

Is not the Bishop therefore, think we, very judicious, in taking Peter de Bruys and his disciples for Manichees? whereas he ought to have taken notice of two things in Peter de Clugny: the first is, that Peter de Bruys, whom they accuse of having boiled meat on Good-Friday with broken pieces of the cross, eat of it when he had done, with those who assisted at that execution. The second is, that he maintained that Priests and Monks ought rather to marry, than to live in a single state defiled with impurity; Coccius makes this article one of the heresies of Peter de Bruys.

One clearly sees what solid grounds the Bishop of Meaux had to accuse Peter de Bruys of Manicheism: let us now see whether he hath any better success with Henry, the disciple of Peter de Bruys.

The burning of Peter de Bruys at St. Gilles did not stifle the doctrine that he maintained; it had taken too deep root in these dioceses: on the contrary, it increased very considerably, after it was once watered with the blood of that martyr. The opposition which the disciples of Peter de Bruys made to the false worship of

the Church of Rome, which they endeavored to introduce into these dioceses, after that they had made them submit to her yoke, was very useful to awaken the people. Pope Eugenius, the disciple of St. Bernard, being then in France, (where he was more exactly informed of these difficulties than the Roman emissaries,) took the alarm very hotly. See here how St. Bernard describes the state of affairs, in a letter of his to the Count St. Gilles.

"How great evils have we heard and known that Henry the heretic hath done and does every day in the churches of God? He wanders up and down in your country in sheep's clothing, being indeed a ravenous wolf: but according to the hint given by our Lord, we know him by his fruits. The churches are without people, people without Priests, Priests without due reverence, and lastly, Christians without Christ. The churches of Christ are looked upon as synagogues; the sanctuary of God is denied to be holy; sacraments are no longer esteemed sacred; holy feasts are deprived of festival solemnities; men die in their sins; souls are frequently snatched away to appear before the terrible tribunal, who are neither reconciled by repentance, nor armed with the sacred communion: the life of Christ is denied to Christian infants, by refusing them the grace of baptism; nor are they suffered to draw near unto salvation, though our Saviour tenderly cries on their behalf, Suffer little children to come unto me. - This man is not of God, who acts and speaks things so contrary to God; and yet, alas, he is listened to by many, and has a people that believe him. O most unhappy people! at the voice of an heretic all the voices of the Prophets and Apostles are silenced, who from one Spirit of truth have declared, that the Church is to be called by the faith of Christ out of all the nations of the world: so that the divine oracles have deceived us, the eyes and souls of all men are deluded, who see the same thing fulfilled, which they read before to have been foretold: which truth, though it be most manifest to all, he alone, by an astonishing and altogether Judaical blindness, either sees not, or else is sorry to see it fulfilled; and at the same time, by I know not what diabolical art, persuades the foolish and senseless people not to believe their own eyes in a thing that is so manifest; and that those that went before have deceived, those that come after have been deceived; that the whole world, even after the shedding of Christ's blood, shall be lost; and that all the riches of the mercies of God, and the grace of the universe, are devoted upon those alone whom he deceives."

Pope Eugenius, finding things in this posture, names Albericus, Bishop of Ostia, for his legate to the people of Tholouse, and to the Count of St. Gilles. Baronius, in his Annals, gives us an account of this Henry, the disciple of Peter de Bruys, and his death, in the year 1147, which seems to be very exact, because St. Bernard writ to the Count of St. Gilles, to exhort him to drive Henry out of his country, where he preached his doctrine very freely: but the earl died in the holy land, having been poisoned there (as it was said) by the queen: wherefore in the year 1147. Henry suffered martyrdom, at the solicitation of St. Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, by the cruelty of Albericus, Bishop of Ostia, Cardinal, and legate of Pope Eugenius II. at Tholouse, where he caused him to be burnt, after they had brought him thither loaded with irons. Baronius sets down with great care whatever he thought might blemish the reputation of the martyr. He relates all that St. Bernard wrote against him to Aldephonsus, Earl of St. Gilles. He quotes St. Bernard, who calls Henry an apostate Monk, and accuseth him of having made use of the great talents he had in preaching, as a means to get money to spend at gaming and upon his lusts. He says, that Henry was a man defiled with adulteries, who, for his frequent crimes, durst not appear in several parts of France and Germany, and who by consequence was not to be endured in the territories of the Count of St. Gilles; but yet he doth not lay any thing of Manicheism to his charge, no more than Peter de Clugny and St. Bernard: nay, Baronius does more; for he formerly distinguished him from those heretics whom St. Bernard opposed under the name of Apostolics, in his 66th Homily upon the Canticles.

How then could the Bishop of Meaux make a Manichee of him? Perhaps the loose life, whereof St. Bernard accuseth him, may be a character of it. But not to undervalue the vanity of this loose accusation, without any proof, and proceeding from a sworn and cruel enemy, which was quite overthrown by the courageous martyrdom of Henry: at this rate the Clergy of the Church of Rome, who were so generally guilty of sodomy, that St. Peter Damian writ a book, entitled Gomorrhæus, must have been Manichees; and upon the same ground Johannes Cremensis, a Cardinal, the Pope's legate in England, for abolishing the marriage of the Priests, must likewise have been a Manichee; for the English historians say, that this holy Cardinal, having assembled a synod at Westminster, wherein he represented to the Priests that it was the worst of crimes to rise from a whore to consecrate the body of Jesus Christ, was himself surprised in bed with a common whore, the same day that he had said mass. Upon this account also the legates of Anacletus, the competitor of Eugenius II. must have been Manichees; for they are taxed with carrying women along with them in men's habits, probably to avoid the inconvenience that Johannes Cremensis fell into in England,

for want of taking this care beforehand. They charge Henry with the same heresies which they attributed to Peter de Bruys; so that what I have already said concerning the heresies of the Petrobusians, I need not repeat here. Baronius adds, I confess, that Henry had superadded to these heresies this proposition, *Additis irrideri Deum canticis ecclesiasticis*, "That the singing in churches was but a mocking of God."

And accordingly Peter de Clugny refutes this pretended heresy with a great deal of earnestness: but if I may speak my opinion in this matter, neither did this proposition contain any great crime. For first, singing in general was owned by Isidore as an innovation. It was about seventy years before, that the Popes had abolished the ancient Liturgies, to substitute the Roman Liturgy. The Gothic Liturgy, which was used in the diocese of Languedoc, and other neighbouring dioceses, which at that time depended on the kings of Spain, had been suppressed, because it was not over-favorable to the opinions of the Church of Rome. Secondly, they had at the same time introduced a sort of rhyming verses, which they call proses, so ridiculous, so foolish, and so full of novelties, both as to the worship of saints, and as to the fabulous stories they contained, that it was very difficult for those who looked for wisdom in their prayers, not to take them for profanations. The hymn composed by King Robert, in honor of Queen Constantia, may give us an hint what sort of things they were, *O Constantia Martyrum*, etc. And now let any one judge whether Henry was a Manichee, because he condemned this sort of profanations.

This also is what hath been owned by Mezeray, in his Chronological Abridgement of the History of France, printed at Amsterdam in 1673, where, upon the year 1163, he saith,

"that there were two sorts of heretics; the one ignorant and loose, who were a sort of Manichees; the other more learned, and remote from such filthiness, who held much the same opinions as the Calvinists, and were called Henricians or Waldenses, though the people ignorantly confounded them with the Cathari, Bulgarians, etc."

Mezeray had spoken more exactly, had he said, that the people were abused by the Bishops and Clergy, who purposely confounded the ancient followers of Peter de Bruys and Henry with the Manichees and Cathari, to make them odious.

CHAPTER 15

That it doth not appear from the conference of Alby, that the Albigenes were Manichees.

Having thus justified Peter de Bruys, Henry, and his disciples, from the imputation of Manicheism, which the Bishop of Meaux has endeavored to fasten upon them, we will yet further endeavor to clear this point, by examining the conference of Alby, from whence the Bishop thinks that he has drawn a solid argument to confirm his imputation. Let us see how this conference is related by Roger Hoveden, in his Annals upon the year 1176. "It was in this year that the Arian heresy was condemned, which had well nigh infected all the province of Tholouse. There were," saith he, "certain heretics in the province of Tholouse, who called themselves The Good Men; they were supported by the militia of Lombez, and preached and taught the people contrary to the Christian faith, professing themselves not to own the Law of Moses, nor the Prophets, nor the Psalms, nor any part of the Old Testament, nor the doctors of the New Testament, save only the Gospels, and the Epistles of St. Paul, with the seven Canonical Epistles, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Revelation."

"Being questioned concerning their faith," proceeds he, "and concerning the baptism of infants, and whether they were saved by baptism; and concerning the body and blood of our Lord, where it was consecrated, or by whom, and who were those that received it; and whether it were more or better consecrated by a good man than by a wicked man; and concerning marriage, if a man and woman could be saved, that knew one another carnally. They answered, that they would say nothing of their faith nor of the baptism of infants; neither were they obliged to say any thing of those matters. Concerning the body and blood of our Savior they said, that he who received it worthily was saved; and that he who received it unworthily procured his own condemnation. Concerning marriage they said, that a man and woman join themselves together to avoid fornication, as St. Paul saith. They also declared many things, without being questioned; as that they ought not to use any oaths whatsoever, as St. John said in his Gospel, and St. James in his Epistle. They said also, that St. Paul had foretold that they ought to ordain Bishops and Priests in the Church; and that if these orders were not conferred upon such as he there commands, that then they were neither Bishops nor Priests, but ravening wolves, hypocrites, and deceivers, who loved the salutations in the market-places, the first places, and the first seats at feasts: who love to be called masters, against the commandment of Jesus Christ; who wear white and shining garments; who wear rings of gold and precious stones on their fingers, which their Master never commanded them. Accordingly they maintained, that since the Bishops and Priests were like to those Priests who betrayed our Saviour Jesus Christ, they ought not to obey them, because they were wicked."

"After divers reasons alleged on both sides in presence of the Bishop of Alby, they chose and settled judges on both sides, with consent of the Bishop of Alby. After this, Roger Hoveden observes, that the Prelates cited divers authorities out of the New Testament, (for these heretics, saith he, would not be determined but by the New Testament,) and that afterwards the Bishop of Lyons pronounced the definitive sentence, drawn from the New Testament, in these terms; I Gislebert, Bishop of Lyons, at the command of the Bishop of Alby and his assessors, do judge that they are heretics; and I condemn the opinions of Oliver and his companions, wherever they are: and we judge this from the New Testament: I bring therefore, for this reason, proofs to confirm the divinity of the Old Testament, drawn from the New, and thereby oppose these heretics, because they owned that they received Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms, only in those particulars which Jesus and his Apostles had by their testimony approved, and not in others: whereupon he maintains with reason, that if an instrument or testimony in writing is allowed of in one part, the whole must needs be owned, or else wholly cast aside."

"In the second place, saith he, we convict them, and judge them to be heretics, by the authorities of the New Testament; for we say, that he has not the Catholic faith who doth not confess it when he is required, and when it is exposed to any danger; whence it is that our Lord, in the Acts of the Apostles, saith to Ananias, speaking of Paul, For he is to me a chosen vessel, to carry my name, etc. These heretics also

boast themselves that they do not lie; whereas we maintain that they lie manifestly, for there is deceit in holding one's peace, as well as speaking; wherefore also Paul boldly resisted Peter to his face, because he gave way to the circumcised."

"In the third place, saith he, we convict and judge them to be heretics by the authorities of the New Testament; for we say that God will have all men to be saved, etc. After which he produces the proofs for infant baptism, and solves the objection taken from infants wanting faith, without which it is impossible to please God: we say that it is by the faith of the Church, or of their godfathers, as the man sick of the palsy was healed by the faith of those who presented him, and let him down through the tiling of the house."

"In the fourth place, saith he, we do convict and judge them as heretics by the authorities of the New Testament, because the body of our Lord cannot be consecrated but by a Priest, be he good or bad; which he proves, because consecration is made by the words of Jesus Christ. Moreover, he proves that the consecration of the body of our Lord must be celebrated in the church, and by the ministers of the church only, whose authority he asserts from passages of Scripture."

"Clerks therefore and laymen, pursues he, must be obedient for God's sake to these Priests, Bishops, and Deacons, be they good or bad, according to what our Lord saith, The Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses's chair: whatsoever therefore they say, do ye; but do not according to their works: for they say, and do not."

"In the fifth place, we convict and judge them to be heretics by the authority of the New Testament, because they will not own that man and wife, if carnally joined, can be saved; and yet they are wont to preach in public, that man and wife cannot be saved, if they know one another carnally: by striving to preach up the study of virginity, saith he, they seem to derogate from the state of marriage, and to condemn it; which he refutes by the common proofs."

"In the sixth place, saith he, we convict and judge by the authorities of the New Testament, that they are heretics, and separated from the unity of the Church; for we say that the Lord hath given the power to St. Peter, of binding and absolving, saying, Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound, etc. and St. James say, If any one among you be sick, let him call for the Priests of the Church, etc. and again, Behold, I send unto you wise men and scribes; but as our Lord saith, All men cannot comprehend this saying."

"Moreover, we say, that they ought to have stood up, in answering and disputing concerning the Gospel, because all Christians stand when the Gospels are read; now if we ought to stand when they are read, much more ought we to stand when they are read and expounded together. Neither ought they to have sat down, after that they had once chosen to stand. Besides, we have many authorities, by which it plainly appears that we ought to be standing when the Gospel is reading, as that where it is said, And Jesus stood in the plain; and again, Jesus stood and cried, saying; and again, There stands one in the midst of you, whom ye know not. Moreover, Jesus was in a standing posture, when, after his resurrection, he confirmed his disciples, and preached unto them; as it is written, Jesus stood in the midst of his disciples, and said, Peace be with you. And as for them, saith the Bishop, they have no right to judge, but only to answer; for the Lord ought to sit, to whom all judgment is committed by the Father. But as for them, they judge not, but are judged, and it is not permitted to them to preach in the churches. These heretics are such as St. Paul foretells of, when he saith, that there shall be wicked men and seducers, who will go on to grow worse and worse, deceiving and being deceived; for the time shall come, that they will not bear sound doctrine, but will turn their ears away from the truth to fables. And again, From which some going astray, have given themselves to vain things, who desiring to be teachers of the law, understand not what they say or affirm. He maintains, that they ought to punish the disobedience of those heretics, and to give them public correction, according to St. Paul's saying, that sinners should be reprov'd openly in the presence of all for their amendment. St. Paul also, speaking to Bishops, saith, Being always ready to reprove every disobedience, and having power to confute those that gainsay; and again, Exhort, rebuke, and reprove with all authority; and again, I have delivered them to Satan, etc. Moreover, Being absent, I have already judged, etc. And lastly, Whoever shall preach any other thing, let him be accursed."

"In the seventh place, the said Bishop questioned them concerning repentance, whether it were saving when performed at the last gasp, or whether soldiers mortally wounded may be saved, if they repent at last; or

whether every one ought to confess their sins to the Priest and Ministers of the church, or to some layman, or to those of whom St. James says, Confess your sins one to another? To which they answered, that it was sufficient for those that were sick to confess to whom they would. As for soldiers, they would answer nothing, because St. James there speaks only of the sick. It was also asked them, whether one single act of contrition of heart, and one confession of the mouth were sufficient, or whether satisfaction were necessary, after penance had been enjoined, in deploring their sins by fasting, alms, and affliction, if they had opportunity. To which they answered, saying, that St. James said, Confess your sins one to another, that you may be healed: so that by these words they knew that the Apostle did not enjoin any thing else, but only to confess to one another; and that so they should be saved; and that they would not be better than the Apostle, by adding any thing thereto of their own, as the Bishops do."

"The heretics added besides, that the Bishop who pronounced sentence was an heretic, and not they; and that he was their enemy, and a ravening wolf, a hypocrite, and an enemy of God; and that he had not judged rightly, and that they would not answer any thing concerning their faith, because they mistrusted him, as our Lord had commanded them in the Gospel; Beware of false prophets, who come unto you in sheeps clothing, but inwardly are ravening wolves: and that he was their malicious persecutor; and they were ready to make it appear from the Gospels and the Epistles, that he was not a good Pastor, neither he, nor all the rest of the Bishops and Priests, but rather hirelings."

"The Bishop answered, that the sentence had been duly pronounced against them, and that he was ready to verify the same, either in the court of Lord Alexander the Catholic Pope, or in the court of Lewis King of France, or of Raimond Earl of Tholouse, or of his wife who was present, or in the court of Frenkwel who was there present; that he had passed a right judgment; and that they were evidently heretics, and branded as such. He promised also that he would indict them for heresy, and that he would denounce them to be such in all Catholic courts."

"The heretics seeing themselves convicted and confounded, turned themselves towards all the people, saying, Good people, the faith which we now confess, we confess for your sakes. The Bishop answered, You say, that you speak for the sake of the people, and not for Godsake. And they said, We believe that there is one only God, in three Persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and that the Son of God hath taken our flesh upon him, that he was baptized in Jordan, that he fasted in the wilderness, that he hath preached our salvation; that he suffered, died, and was buried; that he descended into hell, that he rose again the third day, that he ascended into heaven, that he sent the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, that he shall come at the day of judgment to judge both the quick and the dead, and that all shall rise again. We know also, that what we believe with our heart, we ought to confess with our mouth. We believe, that he is not saved who doth not eat the body of Jesus Christ, and that the body of Jesus Christ is not consecrated but in the church, and by the Priest, be he good or bad; and that it is no better consecrated by a good than by a bad one. We believe also, that none can be saved but those that are baptized, and that little children are saved by baptism. We believe also, that man and wife are saved, though they be carnally joined; and that every one must repent with his mouth and heart, and be baptized in the church by a Priest; and that if they could shew them more from the Gospels and Epistles, they would believe and own it."

"The said Bishop told them also, that if they should swear, they would be obliged to keep the faith; and if there were any thing else, that they ought to confess it, because before they had maintained wicked opinions, and had spoken ill. They answered, that they could not swear at all, because in so doing they should sin against the Gospel and the Epistles. Whereupon, they produced against them authorities out of the New Testament; and after they had been cited and heard on both sides, one of the Bishops, standing up, passed his judgment in this manner:"

"I Gozelin, Bishop of Lodeve, by permission and command of the Bishop of Alby and his assessors, do judge and declare openly, that these heretics are in a wrong opinion concerning the matter of oaths: they must swear, if so be they desire to be received, for in matters of faith men ought to swear: and forasmuch as they are infamous, and stained with heresy, they must clear their innocence; and returning to the unity of the Church, they must confirm their faith by an oath, as the Catholic Church holds and believes; that so the weak ones that are in the Church be not corrupted, and that the infected sheep may not spoil the whole flock. Neither is this contrary to the Gospel, or to the Epistles of St. Paul; for though it be said in the Gospel, Let your communication be Yea, yea, Nay, nay; and, Thou shalt not swear, neither by the heaven,

nor by the earth, etc. yet it is not forbidden to swear by God, but only by the creatures: for the heathens worshipped the creature; and if it were permitted to swear by creatures, we should give to the creatures the respect and honor which is due to God alone; and thus idols and creatures would be adored as God."

"After several arguments to prove the lawfulness of swearing, he added; Or it may be, those expressions in the Gospel and the Epistle of St. James are only by way of advice, and not by way of precept, because if men did not swear, they would not be forsworn; and whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil, that is, of sin or of the Devil, who persuades men to swear by creatures. Finding therefore that they were convicted in this point also, they said that the Bishop of Alby had agreed with them that he would not force them to swear; which the Bishop of Alby denied, and standing up, said, I confirm the sentence which Gozelin, Bishop of Lodeve, hath pronounced, which was given by my order; and I give notice to the militia of Lombez not to protect them. This was signed by the nine Bishops, Clerks, Abbots, and laymen, with this conclusion, We approve this sentence, and we know they are heretics, and we reject their opinion."

This is the substance of what passed at the conference of Alby, according to the relation of Roger Hoveden. One sees that he represents to us these three things: First, the accusations laid to the charge of the Albigenses: they are accused of several articles which are pure Manicheism. Secondly, the arguments they brought to convict them. Thirdly, the confession of faith of the Albigenses, in opposition to their accusations.

As for their accusations, we are to observe, that they are only consequences of their being looked upon as heretics, such as they pretended had been long since condemned in the councils held against the Manichees; and accordingly they make a recapitulation of the errors, either defended by the Cathari, or commonly attributed to them; and with these they charge the Albigenses without further ceremony.

They produce indeed some witnesses who accuse them, and maintain that they have heard some of them maintain Manichean propositions. But the manner of their justifying themselves confounds this accusation and these witnesses.

1. They declare, that the silence they kept was like that of Jesus Christ, who sometimes held his peace without answering the questions of the Pharisees.
2. They called the persons appointed to confront them false witnesses and impostors, in as handsome a manner as could be shown to persons of their quality who appeared against them.
3. They propound their confession of faith in terms wholly orthodox; addressing themselves to the people who had been witnesses of these horrid accusations.

Probably some will say, Here is a company of men actually accused of abominable heresies, and here are persons produced to prove it really upon them. To this I have three things to answer.

1. That we have this conference from the hand of their enemies only.
2. That what is insisted on concerning the authority of their witnesses is overthrown by a very natural reflection; which is, that the integrity of the Waldenses was so well known, and their adversaries so much noted for their inclinations to calumny, that the princes and all the people favored them. This is observed by Puylaurens in his Chronicle, and it is taken notice of by Ribera in his Antiquities of Thoulouse; and yet their enemies have still gone on to accuse them of Manicheism.

CHAPTER 16

The Albigenses justified by a conference, whereof we have an account written by Bernard of Foncaud.

What I have here represented in general might be sufficient to clear the Albigenses from the charge of Manicheism, which the Bishop of Meaux, after so many ages, hath improved against them, but that we have something more to say. This Bishop, who makes the Waldenses only schismatics from the Church of Rome, though he looks upon them as another sort of schismatics than Donatists, hath pretended to prove this business infallibly, by the conference, whereof Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, hath given us the relation, and which was held in presence of Bernard, Archbishop of Narbon. He observes therefore, that it appears from the said conference, that those against whom the dispute was maintained differed from the Church of Rome only in the following articles.

"The dispute," saith he, "chiefly concerned the obedience that is due to Pastors, which we find that the Waldenses denied, and that, notwithstanding all prohibitions to the contrary, they believed they had power to preach, both men and women; and since this their disobedience could not be grounded but upon the unworthiness of the Pastors, the Catholics, in proving obedience to be due unto them, prove it to be due even to those that are wicked; and that, whatsoever the channels be, believers do not fail of receiving grace through them. For the same reason, they shew, that this speaking against their pastors, whence the pretence of disobeying them was taken, is forbidden by the law of God. Afterwards they confute the liberty that laymen took to themselves of preaching without leave of their Pastors, and indeed in opposition to their prohibitions; and they shew that this seditious kind of preaching tends to the subversion of the weak and ignorant. Above all, they prove from Scripture, that women, to whom silence only is recommended, must not undertake to teach.

Lastly, they represent to the Waldenses, that they do ill in rejecting prayer for the dead, which hath so much foundation in Scripture, and so clear a succession in tradition. And as these heretics absented themselves from the churches, to pray amongst themselves in private in their houses, they tell them that they ought not to leave the house of prayer, the holiness whereof was so much recommended in Scripture, and even by the Son of God himself."

Here we may see the Albigenses, in case they be the persons concerned, (though the Bishop pretends they are the Waldenses,) sufficiently cleared from all the accusations of Manicheism that can be formed against their faith. For according to these articles, if we believe the Bishop of Meaux, they cannot be charged with any thing of Arianism, much less of Manicheism.

I cannot perfectly agree to what the Bishop of Meaux concludes, from their examining only these pretended differences in the conference held before the Archbishop of Narbon, that there was no other difference betwixt the Church of Rome and those against whom the Papists disputed at this conference. There are solid reasons that hinder me from being of the Bishop's opinion: but however it be, he cannot defend himself from having furnished his adversaries with the most compendious way in the world to overthrow without much inquiry all that he had done to prove that the Albigenses were guilty of Manicheism.

For in truth this dispute, whereof the Abbot of Foncaud gives us an account, was not maintained against the Vaudois, but against the Albigenses. For,

1. the Bishop might easily have discovered as much from the presence of the Archbishop of Narbon, the matter in question relating to the interest of his diocese.
2. Because the Abbot of Foncaud, who is the relater, was one of the principal actors, his abbey being in the diocese of Narbon.

3. Because this conference, with some others, served as a prologue to the cruelties exercised against the Albigenses; the Church of Rome and her Ministers having already made use of these ways of sweetness, before they came to the extremities of a croisade, which interrupted their other projects towards Greece and the Holy Land.

It follows clearly from hence, that, according to the acknowledgment of the Bishop, the Albigenses cannot be more justly accused of Manicheism than the Vaudois, concerning whom he pretends that the Abbot of Foncaud speaks.

I cannot imagine how the Bishop can answer the force of this argument, except only by denying that he is mistaken, and pretending that this conference was held with some of the Vaudois, who had fled into the diocese of Narbon, and had so considerably propagated their doctrine there, that a public dispute was judged necessary to stop the progress of it.

But first, it would be very strange that they should be able in so short a time to make themselves more considerable than the Petrobusians and the Henricians, with whom we know that the dioceses of Aquitain and Narbon were already filled, according to the testimony of their enemies. Secondly, were it so, it would be necessary to suppose that Bernard, Archbishop of Narbon, who died the second of October, 1191, made it his business to stop the progress of some of Waldo's disciples, who at that time could scarcely be known, (John de Beauxmains, Archbishop of Lyons, who condemned Peter Waldo, not having possessed his see above ten years, as far as we can judge, which he then quitted to retire to Clairvaux,) whilst in the mean time he took no notice of the Petrobusians and Henricians. Thirdly, it is ridiculous to suppose, against the credit of all historians, that the Vaudois composed a distinct body from the Albigenses, who, as we shall shew hereafter, clearly suppose that there were no Vaudois that had churches, and that made a distinct body. Fourthly, neither do we find that the cruel Inquisition made any such like distinction about this matter, in using more or less cruelty, according to the degrees of schism and heresy, as it is pretended they ought to do, in case they would act justly.

But whatever answer the Bishop may invent to defend his opinion, we have a sure way to overthrow it without remedy, and it is the same which he himself hath furnished us with; for he owns that the conference of 1206, mentioned by the Monk of Vaux Cernay, was a conference with the Vaudois. Besides that which Bernard, Abbot of Foncaud, hath set down, we have another, saith he, in Peter of Vaux Cernay, about the year 1206, where the Vaudois were confounded: now all men know that the conference of 1206 was held with the Albigenses, as Peter of Vaux Cernay, who lived at that time, assures us in his History of the Albigenses.

But why then, will the Bishop say, did not they dispute before the Bishop of Nismes and the Archbishop of Narbon, but only upon these four points? The question is easily answered: they disputed about many other articles; but either he who wrote the conference did not give us a relation of the whole, as not supposing it convenient to publish their objections against those other opinions and superstitions which the Albigenses opposed; or else they wanted time to examine the other articles of the Roman faith which they rejected.

What I say now is not a conjecture at random, produced only to stop the Bishop's answer, but is matter of fact grounded upon the relation which we have of the conference of Montreal, as I shall shew hereafter.

All this will lead us to pass a true judgment on the condemnations which the Popes, King Alphonsus, and the Emperor Frederic II. issued out against the Albigenses in their bulls and edicts. They endeavoured in short to make them be looked upon as infamous Manichees, as a company of Arians, and as the most execrable heretics. The Popes prepossessed the kings and emperors with these notions by the reproachful names which they fastened upon them, after they had gotten the power to lead them by the nose as so many wild beasts: hence proceeds that heap of names which we find in the bulls and edicts of that time.

The reflection we ought to make on all these terms of obloquy is this, that excepting only the names of Publicans and Cathari, particularly given to the Manichees, it appears from these edicts, that the Albigenses and the Waldenses did both believe the same thing.

But if what I have said is sufficient to shew the injustice of the Bishop of Meaux in making the Albigenses pass for Manichees, the matter may be still further cleared, if we turn over the books of Alanus Magnus, surnamed the Universal Doctor; for it appears clearly from his treatise against the heretics of his time, and above all against the Albigenses, which he dedicated to William, Prince of Montpellier, that it was the fashion at that time to treat the Albigenses as Manichees, and to confound them with those heretics, whereas their faith was very opposite to that of the Manichees; for in his refutation he huddles them all together without almost any distinction, though their principles were very different. It seems he made use of this way, that he might make use of his common places the better; or else he did it to avoid frequent repetitions.

In the first place therefore Alanus refutes the Manichees, who asserted that there were two principles, whereof the one was good, the other evil, and maintained that the evil god had created the world; of whom also some affirmed that the souls of men were apostate angels, who should be saved after their abode in human bodies; and that the souls of the patriarchs had no share in the salvation of Jesus Christ. They held likewise that Jesus Christ did not take upon him a true body, and that he never eat or drunk. They believed that the body of man was the workmanship of the Devil, and that it should not rise again; and they seemed to think that souls perished with their bodies.

He refutes some, who, though they believed the flesh of Jesus Christ, yet denied him to be the Son of God: others, who maintained that Jesus Christ had taken a celestial body; that the Virgin had been created in heaven, and had neither father nor mother. He takes up the first thirty-four chapters of his first book in confuting these opinions.

Afterwards, in his 35th chapter, he refutes the opinion of those who pretended that the Law of Moses was published by the Devil, and that the Fathers of the Old Testament were all damned.

As to the sacraments, whereof he treats from the 39th chapter, he owns that some of those heretics, whom he opposeth in general, absolutely rejected baptism; these were Manichees: that others denied the efficacy of it to infants, denying original sin: that others again believed it unprofitable to children, and only useful for those of riper years: and he disputes against every one of these opinions.

In chapter 45 he disputes against those who denied baptism to be useful without the imposition of hands. Afterwards he confutes those that maintained that we ought not, after having obtained the pardon of our sins in baptism, hope to obtain the same grace a second time by repentance, which in obliged them to excommunicate those who relapsed into their sins after baptism, which they proved from the 6th and 10th chapters of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and because penance was no more to be reiterated than baptism or orders. It seems that these Albigenses had a discipline like that which prevailed in the Church before the Council of Carthage in Tertullian's time, where they never admitted to the Communion those who had committed any great crimes after their baptism.

In the 50th chapter he attacks other heretics, who asserted that penance did not procure remission of sins, because it is God alone that can pardon sins. One sees plainly enough what they meant, especially because he adds, that they believed it was sufficient to confess their sins to God, which they proved by the authorities of St. Ambrose, St. Maximus, and St. Chrysostom.

He says that these heretics denied transubstantiation. It is worth observing to see with what force and subtilty they disputed against this doctrine: I shall produce the arguments themselves of the Albigenses, which Alanus endeavors to confute. *Et hoc sic probare conantur: Si singulis diebus panis in corpus Christi mutaretur, illud in infinitum augetur. Quaerunt etiam utrum ille panis desinat esse: si desinit esse, adnihilatur, et ita etiam corrumpitur. Item, quaerunt quomodo corpus tantae quantitatis intrat per os hominis? Item, si corpus Christi comeditur, dentibus atteritur, et ita in partes dividitur, item, panis fit corpus Christi, ergo erit corpus Christi, et ita aliud quam sit. Item, panis fiet corpus, ergo de pane fiet corpus Christi, et sic de pane erit materia corporis Christi. Item, post transubstantiationem remanent accidentia; ergo in alio subjecto, vel in aere; sed si in aere, aliqua pars aeris est rotunda, sapida, et secundum quod illa forma defertur per diversa loca, mutant accidentia subjectum. Item, in eadem parte aeris manent illa accidentia, et illa soliditas est in aere, cum illa sint solida, et sic aer solidus est: Ex his videtur, quod accidentia illa non sint in aere, sed nec in corpore Christi sunt: nec est assignare aliquid*

corpus in quo sint, ergo non videntur remanere accidentia. Item, cum forma illa sub qua latet corpus Christi dividatur in partes, sub illa forma desinit corpus Christi: quomodo ergo sub singulis portionibus illius Hostiae datur corpus Christi? Item, si corpus Christi latet sub illa exigua forma, ubi est Christi caput vel pes? Et ita indistincta sunt membra illius. Item, Christus dedit suum corpus discipulis ante passionem: sed dedit eis mortale vel immortale: si immortale dedit, se tunc erat mortalis; ergo quando erat mortalis immortalis erat, quod est impossibile. Item, ponatur quod aliquis celebraverit divina tempore passionis Christi, corpus existens Romae, passum fuisset Romae, quia ubicunque erat, patiebatur tempore passionis, et sic non patiebatur tantum in Hierusalem, sed in multis aliis locis. Item, ponatur quod mus accedat ad pyxidem, in qua est Christi corpus; mus aliquid comedit, ergo aera, vel accidens, vel corpus: sed quod comedit aera, vel accidens, absurdum est, et magis absurdum quod comedit corpus Christi. Item, cum sanguis Christi glorificatus sit, nec faciat localem distantiam, videtur quod calice repleto sanguine, alius liquor possit infundi. Item, Christus ait in Evangelio, Omne quod in os intrat in seressum emittitur. Ergo Christi corpus non intrat, quando ad manducandum datur, nec in secessum emittitur.

"And this they endeavor to prove thus: If the bread every day should be changed into the body of Christ, it would be infinitely increased. They inquire also, whether the bread cease to be: if it ceaseth to be, then is it annihilated, and so it is spoiled. Also they ask, How a body of so great a bulk can enter into the mouth of a man? Whether the body of Christ be eaten, chewed with teeth, and consequently divided into parts? Whether the bread becomes the body of Christ, because then it will be the body of Christ, that is to say, something else than it is? Whether the bread becomes the body; and if so, then bread is the body of Christ, and so bread will be the matter of Christ's body? Also after transubstantiation the accidents do remain; if so, they must be in another subject, in the air, for instance; but if there, then some part of the air must be round, savoury, and white; and as this form is carried through divers places, so the accidents change their subject. Again, these accidents abide in the same part of the air, and thus solidity will be in the air, because they are solid, and consequently the air will be solid. Hence it appears that these accidents are not in the air; neither are they in the body of Christ; neither can any other body be assigned, in which they are, so that the accidents do not seem to remain. Again, when the form or figure, in which the body of Christ lieth hid, is divided into parts, the body of Christ continues no longer in that figure which it had before: how therefore can the body of Christ be in every part of that Host? Again, if the body of Christ be hid in that little form, where is the head or foot? and consequently his members must be indistinguished. Again, Christ gave his body to his disciples before his passion: now he gave it them either mortal or immortal; if he gave it immortal, yet it is certain that then it was mortal; and consequently whilst it was mortal, it was immortal, which is impossible. Again, suppose we that some one or other had celebrated the Communion at the time that Christ suffered; the body that was (suppose) at Rome would have suffered there, because, wheresoever it was, it suffered at the time of the passion; and so Christ would have suffered not only at Jerusalem, but in many other places. Again, suppose that a mouse should come to the pix, in which the body of Christ is, and eat some part of it, the mouse would eat either air, or accidents, or the body of Christ; but it is absurd to say that the mouse should eat either air or accidents; and much more absurd it is to say that it eats the body of Christ. Again, seeing that the blood of Christ is glorified, and does not fill a place, it seems to follow, that when the cup is full of blood, some other liquor may be poured into it. Again, Christ saith in the Gospel, Whatsoever enters in at the mouth is cast forth into the draught; whence it will follow, that the body of Christ doth not go in at the mouth when it is given to be eaten, or if it does, it must be cast forth into the draught."

In the 59th chapter he relates this objection of the Albigenses concerning the same matter: *Quaerunt etiam haeretici, utrum sit articulus fidei Christianae panem transubstantiari in corpus Christi, cum de hoc non fiat mentio in aliquo Symbolo: non enim in Symbolo Apostolico, scilicet, Credo in Deum; vel in Nicaeno, Credo in unum, etc. vel in Symbolo Athanasii, Quicunque vult, etc. Cum in his Symbolis de omnibus articulis Christianae fidei fiat mentio, cur non fiat mentio de illo ineffabili sacramento, cui magis videtur obviare humana ratio?*

"The heretics also demand, whether it be an article of the Christian faith, that the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ, seeing there is no mention made of it in any Creed: for we do not meet with it in the Apostles' Creed, that is, *Credo in Deum*; nor in the Nicene, that is, *Credo in unum*; nor in the Athanasian, *Quicunque vult*: and since in these Creeds are contained all the articles of the Christian faith, why is there no mention of this ineffable sacrament, which of all things seems most contrary to reason?"

I have set down these arguments in order, first, Because it is visible to any one that will take the pains to examine them, that they are the same that were urged by Berengarius, as appears by the extracts of his book, which Lanfrank has preserved, and afterwards by those, who in the twelfth century endeavored to qualify and defend the absurdities of the confession which they made Berengarius sign. Secondly, Because it plainly appears that those who admitted the three Creeds, the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian, did not reject the use of matrimony, which yet he lays to their charge, there being nothing more remote from Manicheism. Neither doth he impute it, save only to some of these heretics; which makes it manifest, that he hath confounded all these people together, and that he only pursued his matter, and his common places, without giving us particularly the opinions of every one of these heretics.

We find, that he charges them with rejecting the sacrament of confirmation, because there is no mention made of it, neither in the Gospel nor in the other books of the New Testament, as an institution of Christ. They rejected also the sacrament of orders, as it was believed in the Church of Rome. See what Alanus saith of it: *Dicunt etiam fidei Catholicae inimici, ordinem, ut Diaconatum vel Sacerdotium, non esse sacramentum, quod sic probare conantur: Non legitur in aliqua canonica Scriptura Apostolos ordinatos fuisse in Sacerdotes, cur ergo eorum vicarios sic ordinari oportet? Item, Apostoli qui majores Sacerdotes dicti sunt, non leguntur uncti fuisse chrismate; cur ergo ungentur eorum vicarii? Praeterita merita faciunt et suffragantur ut quis sit dignus aliquo officio, quid ergo confert ordo?*

"Besides, the adversaries of the Catholic faith affirm, that the order of Deacons or Priests is not a sacrament, which they endeavor to prove thus: We do not read in any part of canonical Scripture that the Apostles were ordained Priests; and therefore what necessity is there that: their vicars should be so? Again, the Apostles, who are said to be the higher Priests, were never anointed; and why then are their vicars anointed? It is forepast merit and true worth that makes one fit for any function; what need therefore is there of orders?"

Concerning extreme unction, they believe after this manner: *Dicunt etiam extremam olei unctionem, quae, datur infirmis, nec esse sacramentum, nec aliquem habere effectum, quia hoc sacramentum unctionis infirmorum ab Apostolis institutum non legitur:*

"They say, that extreme unction, which is conferred upon sick persons, is neither a sacrament, nor otherwise of any efficacy, because this sacrament of anointing the sick is not found to be of apostolical institution."

As to churches, we find that they followed the opinions of Henry, the disciple of Peter de Bruis: *Non desunt qui dicant locum materiale non esse Ecclesiam, sed conventum fidelium sanctum: quia, ut aiunt, locus ad orationem non pertinet; sicut enim ubique est Deus, sic ubique adorari vel orari potest. Hoc autem probare nituntur autoritate Christi, dicentis Samaritanae, Mulier, crede mihi, venit hora, quando nec in monte hoc, nec in Hierosolymis, adorabitis Patrem: sed venit hora et nunc est, quando veri adoratores adorabunt in spiritu et veritate. Item, si locus facit ad orationem, cur heremitae antiquitus in locis abditis habitantes, ecclesias non habebant? Cur etiam sacramenta effectum suum habent, etsi non celebrantur in loco qui dicitur ecclesia? Item, quid operantur parietes ad supplicandum ei qui ubique est, cum in uno loco non magis sit quam in alio? Christum etiam in montibus et locis desertis legimus orasse, non in locis orationi dedicatis. Item, estne fructuosior oratio quae fit in templo, quam illa quae fit in agro, si par fuerit devotio?*

"There be some who affirm, that the Church is not a material place, but an holy assembly of believers; for, say they, place is not of any concern to prayer, because as God is every where, so he may every where be worshipped and prayed to. This they endeavor to prove by the authority of Christ, saying to the Samaritan woman; Woman, believe me, the hour comes when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor at Jerusalem, worship the Father; but the hour comes and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth. Again, if the place be any furtherance to prayer, why had not the hermits of old, who lived in desert places, their churches to pray in? Or how can the sacraments be of any efficacy, when they are not celebrated in a place called a church. Again, what do walls help us to pray to him who is every where, and not more in one place than he is in another? We read also, that Christ went aside to mountains and desert places to pray, and not to places appointed for prayer. Again, is the prayer that is performed in

the church of more efficacy than that which is offered up in the fields, supposing the devotion of both to be alike?"

Against the prayers that are made to saints, they objected as follows: *Dicunt etiam heretici quidam, orationes sanctorum non prodesse vivis, nec vivorum orationes mortuis: probare etiam videntur, quod sancti non orant pro vivis, qui sciunt qui sint salvandi vel damnandi; pro illis autem quos sciunt salvandos non orant, quia superflua esset oratio, quia sive orent, sive non, salvabuntur: si vero orarent pro damnatis, non assequerentur quod petunt, et ita beati non essent; beatus enim est, cui omnia optata succedunt. Item, quilibet judicabitur secundum opera sua, et non aliena merita, nec pro alienis meritis reddetur ei: et ideo orationes sanctorum non prosunt; vel quantum ad meritum, vel quantum ad praemium; quia non augent merita vel praemia. Item, sancti non sunt in loco merendi, sed recipiendi; ergo orationibus nec aliis bonis merentur sibi vel aliis. Item, in Evangelio Lucae legitur, quod Abraham dixit animae divitis quae erat in inferno, Magnum chaos firmatum est inter nos et vos; ubi chaos nihil aliud vocavit, nisi dissimilitudinem bonorum et malorum tantam, ut etiam sancti damnatis non compatiantur. Si vero non compatiantur, nec orant pro eis.*

"Some heretics also assert, that the prayers of saints are of no use to the living, nor those of the living to the dead. That the saints do not pray for the living, they prove thus: Because the saints, knowing who shall be saved and who damned, they cannot pray for those they know shall be saved, since their prayers would be superfluous, seeing whether they pray or no, they will be saved; but should they pray for those that shall be damned, they would not obtain what they pray for, and so would not be happy; for he is only happy, who has all his desires. Again, every one shall be judged according to his works, and not according to the merits of another, neither shall any man receive according to the merits of other men; and therefore the prayers of the saints profit nothing, neither in regard of merit or reward, because they cannot increase either a man's merit or reward. Again, the saints are not in a place where they can merit, but only where they receive; and therefore by their prayers or other good works can neither merit any good for themselves or for others. Again, we read in the Gospel of St. Luke, that Abraham said to the soul of the rich man that was in hell, There is a great gulf fixed between us and you; where by gulf he means nothing else but the disagreement there is between the good and the wicked, which is so great, that the saints are neither sensible, nor have any compassion for the damned; now if so, neither can we suppose that they pray for them."

At last, he attributes to some of them the belief that it is unlawful to eat flesh, upon very ridiculous grounds, but such as have nothing common with the doctrine of the Manichees.

It seems to me to be evident from this book of Alanus, first, That he owned there were several sorts of heretics in the country of the Albigenses, Manichees, or Cathari, who rejected the principal articles of the Christian religion. Secondly, Another sort of people, who renounced all the chief doctrines of the Romish religion, which the protestants rejected afterwards. And since he quotes no author in particular, it is obvious to judge, that he made but small distinction of the nature of the several objections which he pretends to refute, and which he had frequently assigned to the Albigenses in general; which, without doubt, ought not to be attributed but to some of them, and which possibly, and very probably too, was only taken up from the mouths of the common people amongst them, by those who had a design to expose them.

CHAPTER 17

The calumnies raised against the Albigenses, refuted by the conference of Montreal.

Those who will reflect a little upon the innocence of the primitive Christians, and the horrid slanders cast upon them, will not be much surprised to see the innocence of the Albigenses attacked after the same manner. The Devil having found this method succeed in the first beginnings of Christianity, was not so careless of his interest to forget to employ the same against those who opposed themselves to the corruptions which he had introduced, and which he was willing to substitute instead of the religion of Jesus Christ.

He made use of the same method against those of the reformed religion. Whoever reads the writings of the Jesuits shall find that they have accused our Reformers of the same heresies which the Devil raised to put a stop to the progress of Christianity. The Jesuit Gauthier alone may be a sufficient witness hereof, in his Chronological Table; and we may well say, that in this point he hath at least equalized the impudence of Feuarentius, if he hath not outdone him. Why should any man therefore think strange, that the Church of Rome and her adorers should take the same course against the Albigenses, which she practiced in our days; and which she hath not yet left, because she believed it would not fail of certain success? so prodigious is the stupidity of the people of her communion. And truly the managers for the Church of Rome were no less diligent to employ these devilish artifices against the Albigenses, than against us. Here are some instances of it, for it is impossible to relate all; I begin with some of the more general articles:

1. They accused them of novelty, sometimes supposing them to have been only known since the time of Peter de Bruis, or of Henry his disciple; though the contrary be evident from the history of this Church, as we have set it down; and by the public Liturgy, which the Papists themselves have published not long since.
2. They accused them of being the disciples of Peter Waldo, and from thence raised this accusation, that they were only a company of laymen, without either ministry or right to administer the sacraments; whereas it is certain, that they had a lawful ministry, and indeed a thousand times more lawful than that of the Church of Rome.
3. They accused them in general of being Manichees, perhaps, because formerly the Priscillianists, who were a branch of the Manichees, had a party in that province, or near it, as Philastrius tells us, and of whom some were scattered through Languedock, after the year 1010, though indeed the Albigenses disputed against them, and solidly confuted them, as we are informed by William Puylaurens.
4. They endeavored to make them own the opinions and crimes that were proper to the Manichees, by producing false witnesses to convict them thereof. We have an illustrious example of this, in the History of the Earls of Toulouse. William Catel, Counsellor for the King in the Parliament of Tholouse, tells us, that two heretics, whereof the one was called Raymond, the other Bennett, having appeared before the Pope's legate, it was witnessed against them, that they had been heard to preach that there were two gods, the one good, and the other evil; that Priests could not consecrate the holy Host; that married persons could not be saved, if they had to do with their wives; that baptism is not necessary to infants; and many other heresies, which they would never acknowledge, notwithstanding all the witnesses that appeared against them; but said, they were false witnesses, and that they believed what the Catholic religion engageth us to believe. But notwithstanding these their solemn protestations, they further object against them all the consequences of Manicheism as natural inferences from the former opinions, of which they pretended that they had convicted them by witnesses. This probably was the rise of those fine controversies we find in Alanus Magnus, and other polemical writers who copied him.

5. They have been charged with forswearing themselves before a court of justice without scruple, though at the same time they are accused for maintaining that every lie is a mortal sin. This is done by Alanus, who falls upon them very heavily upon that account.

6. They are accused of being Arians, though Alanus distinguisheth them, and that the Popish Priests ought rather to be accused of favoring Manicheism and Arianism, than the Albigenses, who subtilly disputed against these heresies.

But it will be easy to refute these calumnies, by the conference of Montreal, in the year 1206, related by the Monk of Vaux Cernay. It was offered to the Bishops by the Albigenses, under certain conditions: That there should be moderators appointed on both sides, men of authority, able to hinder any tumult or sedition. Also, that the place where the conference was to be, might be free and safe for all those that should assist at it: moreover, that the subjects to be disputed upon should be agreed to by joint consent, and not to be quitted till they were wholly discussed; and that those that could not maintain their opinions by the word of God, should be looked upon as overcome. The Bishops and Monks accepted of all these conditions. The place they agreed upon was Montreal, near Carcasson, in the year 1206; the moderators agreed on on both sides, were B. of Villeneuve, and B. of Auxerre, for the Bishops; and for the Albigenses, R. de Bot, and Anthony Riviere: Arnoldus Hot, the Pastor of the Albigenses, accompanied with those that were thought fit for this action, appeared first at the place and time assigned; and afterwards came the Bishop of Ozma, and the Monk Dominic, a Spaniard, with two of the Pope's legates, Peter Castel and Radulphus de Lust, Abbot of Candets; P. Bertrand, Prior of Auterive, as also the Prior of Palat, and several other Priests and Monks.

The theses propounded by Arnoldus were, that the mass and transubstantiation were the invention of men, and not the ordinance of Jesus Christ or his Apostles.

That the Church of Rome was not the spouse of Christ, but the Church of confusion, drunk with the blood of the martyrs.

That the polity of the Church of Rome was neither good nor holy, nor established by Jesus Christ.

Arnaud sent these propositions to the Bishop, who demanded a fortnight to prepare his answer, which was granted. At the day appointed the Bishop failed not to appear with a large writing; whereupon Arnaud Hot desired leave to be heard upon the spot, extempore, declaring that he would answer all the particulars contained in the said writing, desiring, the auditors not to be tired, if he took up some time in answering so long a discourse; they promised he should be heard with attention and patience, without the least interruption. He discoursed at several times for four days together, with so much admiration of the assistants, and dexterity on his part, that all the Bishops, Abbots, Monks, and Priests, could have been willing to have been farther off; for he deduced his answer according to the several points laid down in that writing, with so much order and perspicuity, that he made his auditors perceive, that, though the Bishop had writ much, yet he had concluded nothing that could be made use of, to the advantage of the Church of Rome, against these propositions. This done, Arnaud demanded, that, since the Bishops and he stood engaged to one another at the beginning of their conference, to prove their assertions by the word of God alone, the Bishops and Priests might be commanded to prove the authority of the mass, as it was sung in churches, piece by piece; that it was instituted by the Son of God, and sung in the same manner by his Apostles, beginning at the Introit, as they call it, to the *Ite missa est*: but the Bishops could not prove that any of those parts had been instituted for that purpose by Christ or by his Apostles. Here it was that the Bishops were covered with shame and regret; for Arnaud had reduced them to the single canon, which they pretended was the best piece of the mass; where he proved that the holy supper of the Lord was not the mass; saying, that if the mass were the Lord's supper, there would be all after consecration that there was before in the Lord's supper: whereas, said he, in your mass there is no bread, for by transubstantiation the bread vanisheth; wherefore the mass, being without bread, cannot be the supper of the Lord, wherein all know there is bread. Jesus Christ brake bread, Saint Paul brake bread, the Priest breaks the body, not bread; therefore the Priest neither doth what Jesus Christ nor what St. Paul did. As Arnaud was about to proceed in these anti-theses between the Lord's supper and the mass, to prove that it was neither of Christ's nor of the Apostles' institution, the Monks, Bishops, Legates, and Priests thought fit to withdraw

themselves, being resolved to hear no more, for fear they might fix impressions on those that were by, which might extremely shake their belief of the mass.

The Monk of Vaux Cernay endeavored to render this action suspected, in saying, that when these heretical judges perceived the weakness of their cause, and the misfortune of engaging in such a dispute, they refused to pronounce any judgment concerning it, as likewise to restore us our own writings, for fear, adds he, they might come to be published, but restored the heretics theirs. But how could two of the Pope's Legates, and so many Bishops, Abbots, Monks, and Priests suffer themselves to be drawn into a place, there to be thus abused and tricked? The Monk himself saith in the same place, that the heads of the heretics came to meet with the Catholics at the castle of Montreal, to dispute with them: the Catholics therefore were in possession of the castle; there could be therefore no opportunity of foul play, nor of any such violence; neither was it necessary that the moderators should pronounce their judgment in a case of dispute; seeing they hold that no other judgment is necessary but that of the Pope, who cannot err. Besides, how could this Monk know that the Albigenses were overcome, seeing that no sentence was given?

Perrin could have given us a faithful extract of this conference, because himself observes, that it had been brought to him from the Albigenses by Mr. Rafur, minister of the church of Montreal, in an old manuscript: from whence, though he doth not express it in so many words, I judge that he reduced the points in question between the Albigenses and the Church of Rome to six articles.

I. Article. The doctrines which they asserted in opposition to the Church of Rome were, that the Church of Rome was not the holy Church, nor the spouse of Christ, but that it was a Church which had drunk in the doctrine of devils; the whore of Babylon, which St. John describes in the Revelations, the mother of fornications and abominations, covered with the blood of the saints.

II. That the mass was neither instituted by Christ nor his Apostles, but a human invention.

III. That the prayers of the living are unprofitable for the dead.

IV. That the purgatory maintained in the Church of Rome is no better than a human invention, to satisfy the avarice of the Priests.

V. That the saints ought not to be prayed unto.

VI. That transubstantiation is a human invention, and erroneous doctrine; and that the worshipping of the bread is manifest idolatry.

That therefore it was necessary to separate from the Church of Rome, in which the contrary was said and taught, because one cannot assist at the mass, without partaking of the idolatry there practiced, nor expect salvation by any other means than by Jesus Christ, nor transfer to creatures the honor which is due to the Creator, nor say concerning the bread, that it is God, and worship it as such, without incurring the pain of eternal damnation, because idolaters shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven. For all these things therefore which they asserted, they have been hated and persecuted to death.

This account of the conference of Montreal, which I have copied from Perrin, is enough in my judgment fully to refute any scruple that might remain in the mind of a reader who reads in Roger Hoveden the letters of Peter, Cardinal of St. Chrysogon writ in the year 1178; which testify, that the Manichees of Toulouse had been convicted by the confession which many of them had made of the greatest part of the articles of that heresy. It is very visible that it was upon the authority of these letters, or upon some informations of this nature, that Alanus, who was born at Lisle in Flanders, and who had spent the greatest part of his time at the university of Paris, has built his catalogue of the heresies which he refutes in his treatise against the Albigenses, whereof I have given an extract in the foregoing chapter.

So that it is necessary to suppose one of these three things: either that the Earl Raymond of Toulouse, and those whom he protected, were really Manichees, as they are accused to be by the Pope's Legates, by the

Bishops, and by Peter of Vaux Cernay, who sets down this accusation, and the forced confessions of the Albigenses, who own themselves to be Manichees; or that the Albigenses, who were the disciples of Peter de Bruys and of Henry, that were no Manichees, had gone over to that sect towards the end of the 12th century, and afterwards again became Petrobusians and Henricians at the beginning of the 13th, as it plainly appears they then were, from the conference of Montreal, where they freely proposed their opinions, entirely opposite to Manicheism; or that the Legates and Monks, that persecuted them with fire and sword, were great impostors in taking advantage against them from some confessions extorted from Manichees, who were here and there scattered in those dioceses, and which they made use of to animate the people of the Roman communion, and to engage the Princes and Bishops of all places to exterminate without mercy a sort of people who utterly subverted all the rules of morality, which is the band of society, and all the principles of both natural and Christian religion.

CHAPTER 18

Reflections on the convictions of Manicheism, which were said to be proved upon the Albigenses.

One of the most plausible objections that can be made against the purity of the faith of the Albigenses, is the testimony of the Inquisitors, who have filled their trials with plain confessions, which several Albigenses, judged and condemned by them, have made of sundry errors of the Manichees. I shall produce an extract of the *Acts of the Inquisition of Toulouse*, which are in the hands of Mr. Wetstein, bookseller at Amsterdam, as it was sent me out of Holland, and which was made by a man of great reputation.

"The Albigenses," saith he, "held some opinions in common with the Vaudois: as, that to a Christian all oaths are unlawful; that the confession of sins, made to the Priests of the Church of Rome, is wholly unprofitable; and that neither the Pope, nor any one else in the Romish Church, can absolve any man of sin: but that they have power to absolve all those from their sins, who will join themselves to their sect, by the laying on of hands. This last clause is also laid to the charge of the Vaudois, viz. that they have power from God alone, as the Apostles had, to hear confessions both of men and women that believe them; and of imposing penance upon such as confess to them, as fasting, and several repetitions of the Lord's Prayer, whereupon they absolve their penitents: and that this absolution and penance is as available to the salvation of their souls as if they had been confessed to their own Priest. (That here is some wresting or mutilation of the opinion of the Vaudois, is manifest from the confession of a certain woman, who, as we read, declared her faith to this purpose; that God alone forgives sin; and that he to whom confession of sins is made gives only his advice what the person ought to do, and so enjoins penance, which any wise and prudent man may do, whether he be a Priest or no.) That the opinions of the Albigenses that were proper to them were, that there be two lords; the one good, and the other evil: that the body of Christ is not in the Eucharist, but only mere bread: that baptism is of no use. One of the Albigenses was said to believe, that the baptism of water, celebrated by the Church, stands infants in no stead, because they did not consent to the sacrament, but cried at the receiving of it. (I believe, saith he who examined these Acts, that they denied baptism to be the instrument of regeneration; or perhaps they might be against infant baptism.) That an external anointing of the sick with material oil was of no use. That the orders of the Church of Rome had no power of binding and loosing; since they themselves, who conferred them, were great sinners. That marriage is always joined with sin, and never can be without sin; and that it could never have been instituted by the good God. That our Lord did not assume a real human body and true flesh of our nature; and that he did not truly, but only in likeness, rise again in the same, and perform the other works of our salvation; and that he never really ascended to the right hand of the Father. They deny the resurrection of the body; (but in the declaration of Petrus Anterior, a chief teacher amongst them, this is more clearly and distinctly explained; that they feign that certain spiritual bodies, and a certain internal man, should rise again in such sort of bodies. And elsewhere they express themselves, that though the souls of men shall come to judgment, yet they shall not come in their own bodies.) They said, that the souls of men were spirits which fell from heaven for their sins; so that they seem to have believed the pre-existence of souls. Man (they say) must not worship what he eats. Moreover, it is ascribed to them, that they believe man is saved by the laying on of hands, which they confer on their believers; and that by the same means all sins are forgiven without confession and satisfaction. That they can bestow the Holy Ghost, for salvation, upon those whom they receive. That the Virgin Mary never was a carnal woman, but their Church, which they say is true repentance; and that this is the Virgin Mary. (The very obscurity of these words shews that this opinion is wrested; because it is better expressed in another place thus; That God never entered the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary; and that he only is the mother, brother, and sister of God, who keeps the commandments of God the Father.) These are said to be the doctrines of the Albigenses, whereof none are ascribed to the Waldenses, but others different from these, whereof we find no mention made in the opinions of the Albigenses; and they are these; That all judgment is forbid by God, and that it is contrary to the Divine prohibition for any judge, in any cause whatsoever, to judge or sentence any man to

punishment of death. That indulgences granted by the Prelates or the Church of Rome are of no use or efficacy. That there is no purgatory for souls after this life; and that consequently the prayers and suffrages of believers for the dead are of no use to them. That the soul, when it departs from the body, goes either to paradise or hell. That there are no more than three orders in the Church, of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons."

From these Acts it appears how much the rites and ceremonies of the Albigenses differed from those practiced by the Vaudois.

"Besides," saith the author of the extract, "the rites and institutions of them both were very different. Of the Albigenses there were two sorts: some who professed their faith and rites, and they were called Perfect, or Comforted; others, who had entered into a covenant with the former sort, called Perfect, which they call la Convenenza, the Agreement, that at the end of their life they should be received by them into their sect. This reception is frequently called by them Exercise, and is performed in this manner; The Benedicite, or the Blessing conferred upon one Molinerius when he was sick. Bernard Goes, one of the Albigenses, held the hands of the sick person between his own hands, and besides held a certain book over him, wherein he read the Gospel of St. John, In the beginning was the Word; and delivered to the sick person a fine thread, to tie about him as a mark that he was admitted into their heresy: upon some others it is said that they laid a white linen cloth, and besides, that many genuflections were performed by the bed-side. This reception was supposed to save the soul of him who was received, and was called a spiritual baptism or consolation, a reception, and a good end, and sometimes a melioration, by means of which they believed that the person was sanctified; so that it was not lawful for a woman to touch any one that was thus received. Now, because it might sometimes happen that the person thus received, after his recovery, might relapse into his former defilements, therefore they always deferred this reception till the extremest weakness, when there was no longer hopes of life, for fear they might afterward lose the good they had received. For which reason also some sick persons amongst them, though the person who thus initiated them was already come, yet were not received, because they were not believed to be at the point of death. But they who were thus received in their sickness were commanded to put themselves upon hardship; that is, to hasten their own death, by abstaining from all meat: and there are several examples of those who are said to have killed themselves, not only with fasting, but by opening of a vein, wounding of themselves, yea, and sometimes too by drinking poison. But others, who had no mind to submit themselves to so hard a law, refused to be received, though this their teacher was come for that purpose. They had also a peculiar way of saluting, by way of embracing one another, laying their hands on each side of one another, and turning their head to both shoulders, saying each time, Benedicite: which kind of salutation seems to have been usual amongst them, because it is to be met with in several accounts of their opinions; and sometimes it was performed with bended knees, sometimes with their hands let down to the ground. Which salutation was sometimes called melioration. Neither did they only require this salutation from those who were received, but from them also who were called Perfect amongst them, and received others, observed the same way of salutation. We read also in many of their books, that such a one did eat of the blessed bread of the heretics; and in some it is added, and saw the manner of blessing it: but what that manner was, is no where described, neither is any circumstance added, from whence it might be gathered, whether they blessed the common bread at their dinners and suppers, or whether this was only a ceremony used by them at the celebrating of the Lord's supper: though it is added in one place, that they call this blessed bread the Bread of Prayer. Three days in the week they keep a fast with bread and water. But we do not read that any of these things were observed by the Waldenses, but what was vastly different: as, that they had some elders of their own; that even laymen bless the table before and after meat; they pray kneeling, and bowing themselves to the ground. It is usual for them to bless the table. They profess to observe apostolical poverty. And besides, they are said to differ from the common conversation of other believers in their life and manners. These are the chief things we meet with in this book concerning the Albigenses and Waldenses; for there is no mention made of the opinions of any other party."

This is the extract which was sent me, with some passages wherein the author gives his own judgment.

One would think, that nothing could be of greater force to convict the Albigenses of Manicheism, especially if we consider, that Emericus, in his *Directory for the Inquisitors*, ascribes almost the very same opinions to the Manichees of Italy.

But I have three things to say, to take off this prejudice: the first is, **That nothing ought to be more suspected by us than these Acts of the Inquisition; for he that is a murderer is certainly a liar and a knave.** I have shewed, in my *Remarks upon the History of the Valleys of Piedmont*, that nothing can be conceived more false than the carriage of the Inquisitors, and that they never pretended to any thing less than to faithfulness in their accounts of things.

This appears from the trials of the Waldenses, whom the Monks have endeavored to make the most infamous heretics; and yet, in the mean time, if we will believe the Bishop of Meaux, they were very far from being Manichees. What authority therefore can the testimonies of the Inquisitors have against the Albigenses, since the Bishop himself acknowledges that they can be of no authority against the Waldenses, who have been no less accused of Manicheism than the Albigenses themselves?

Now, that the reader may be thoroughly convinced of the justice of this our denying to admit these testimonies of the Inquisitors, and Emericus in particular, I might allege here what Emericus hath said of the *Eternal Gospel*, attributed commonly to John of Crema, the seventh General of the Cordeliers. This book contained the most horrid propositions imaginable; and yet now it is pretended, that he was overborne by a cabal of the Inquisition, and they endeavor to justify him against all the accusations of Emericus. But I can do more than this; for I have received from a friend of Mr. G. advocate of N. an extract of the Acts of the Inquisition of Toulouse, which may serve as a pattern to judge of their other trials which are found in that register, where there is scarce any thing of these accusations. The extract runs thus:

Anno Domini 1283, 8 Idus Julii, *Guilhelmus de Maunhaco, filius quondam Guilhelmi Arloyer de Maunhaco, diocesis Aniciensis, eductus de carcere Inquisitorum, constitutus in praesentia Fratris Joannis Vigorosi, ordinis Praedicatorum, Inquisitoris haereticae pravitatis, requisitus per dictum Inquisitorem quod juraret ad sancta Dei Evangelia, ut veritatem diceret de fide sua, respondit, quod non juraret: inquisitus, si erat ei licitum jurare super sancta Dei Evangelia, respondit, quod non. Inquisitus si Papa Ecclesiae Romanae Dominus Martinus qui nunc est, habet potestatem ligandi atque solvendi, respondit, quod non. Inquisitus si Ecclesia Romana, cui praest Papa, sit caput fidei, respondit, quod nec Papa, nec Ecclesia cui praest, est caput fidei, nec Christianitatis, nec agnoscit, nec credit aliquem hominem carnalem esse Papam, nisi Jesum Christum. Inquisitus si Archiepiscopi, Episcopi, et alii Ecclesiarum Praelati, per Romanam Ecclesiam ordinati, sunt veri Praelati, et si habent potestatem ligandi atque solvendi, respondit, quod non. Inquisitus si aliquis baptizatur, ita quod baptizans dicat, Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, Amen, valeat baptizato, et si per talem baptismum habet remissionem peccatorum, respondit, quod non credit quod aliquis carnalis homo possit baptizare, nisi solus Deus. Inquisitus si sacramentum confirmationis, quod confert Episcopus quando confirmat, valet confirmato, respondit, quod nihil valet ei, nec sacramentum est, nec ille qui confert sacramentum est Episcopus, nec aliquid potest. Inquisitus si sacramentum extremae unctionis valet infirmo, quando ei ministratur a Sacerdote, respondit, quod non credit quod valeat ei, nec quod sit sacramentum. Inquisitus si sacramentum ordinis collatum ab Episcopo valet aliquid, et si est sacramentum, respondit, quod nihil valet, nec est sacramentum, nec Episcopus potest aliquod sacramentum conferre. Inquisitus si panis, quem Sacerdos tenet in manibus suis dum celebrat, postquam Sacerdos protulit verba consecrationis, Hoc est corpus meum, remanet panis; respondit, quod panis erat ante, et panis remanet post, et quod magna injuria fit Deo, quod panis commutetur in corpus Christi. Inquisitus si verba Sacerdotis absolventis aliquem ei confessum de peccatis, dicendo, Ego te absolvo ab omnibus peccatis tuis, valent confesso; respondit, quod nihil valent confesso, nec est sacramentum. Inquisitus si est licitum jurare super sancta Dei Evangelia in aliquo casu, dixit quod non. Inquisitus si Rex Franciae qui nunc est comburit vel facit comburi aliquem pro crimine haeresis, vel facit suspendi aliquem pro aliquo crimine, peccet, respondit, quod peccat, nec est ei licitum facere vindictam nec justitiam. Item requisitus si vult credere sacramenta Ecclesiae Romanae sicut nos credimus, et sicut Ecclesia Romana praedicat et observat, respondit, quod nihil aliud crederet, nisi quod superius dixit. Haec deposuit Tholosae coram Fratre Laurentio Aurelianensi, et dicto Fratre Johanne Vigoroso, Inquisitore, in praesentia et testimonio Fratris Arnaldi Del Gras, Fratris Bertrandi Jacobi, et Fratris Raymundi Navarrii, ordinis Fratrum Praedicatorum, et Juliani Vasconii, publici Tholosae notarii, qui haec scripsit.*

"In the year of our Lord 1283, the 8th of the Ides of July, William of Maunhaco, formerly the son of William Arloyer of Maunhaco, of the diocese of Anecy, being brought out of the prison of the Inquisitors, and set in the presence of Brother John Vigorosus, of the order of Preachers, an Inquisitor of heretical

pravity, being demanded by the said Inquisitor to swear by the holy Gospels, that he would declare the truth concerning his faith; he answered, that he would not swear. Being demanded, whether it were lawful for him to swear upon the holy Gospels? he answered, No. Being demanded, whether Lord Martin, the present Pope of the Church of Rome, hath the power of binding and loosing? he answered, No. Being demanded, whether the Church of Rome, over which the Pope presides, be the head of the faith? he answered, that neither the Pope, nor the Church he presides over, is head of the faith, or of the Christian world; neither doth he own or believe that any carnal man can be Pope, but only Jesus Christ. Being demanded, whether Archbishops, Bishops, and other Prelates of Churches, ordained by the Church of Rome, were true Prelates, and whether they have the power of binding and loosing? he answered, No. Being demanded, whether if any one be baptized, the baptizer saying, I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, Amen; whether this be of efficacy to the party baptized; and whether by such baptism he can obtain remission of his sins? he answered, that he did not believe that any carnal man can baptize, but God alone. Being demanded, whether the sacrament of confirmation, which the Bishop confers, be of any use to the person confirmed? he answered, that it was of no use at all; neither is it a sacrament; neither is he who confers it a Bishop, nor hath the power to do any thing. Being demanded, whether the sacrament of extreme unction be of any use to the sick, when it is administered to him by a Priest? he answered, that he did not believe that it did him any good, or that it is a sacrament. Being demanded, whether the sacrament of orders, conferred by the Bishop, were of any use, and whether it be a sacrament? he answered, that it is of no use; neither is it a sacrament; neither can a Bishop confer any sacrament. Being demanded, whether the bread which the Priest holds in his hands whilst he celebrates, after he hath pronounced the words of consecration, This is my body, still remains bread? he answered, that it was bread before, and continued bread still; and that it was a great injury to God to say, that the bread is changed into the body of Christ. Being examined, whether the words of a Priest, whereby he absolves one that hath confessed his sins, saying, I absolve thee of all thy sins, be of any use to the party confessed? he answered, that they were of no use, neither is it a sacrament. Being examined, whether it be lawful to swear upon the holy Gospels of God in any case? he answered, No. Being examined, whether the King of France that now is, by burning, or causing any one to be burnt for the crime of heresy, or by hanging any other criminal, doth sin? he answered, He doth; and that it is not lawful for him to execute vengeance, or do justice. Also being examined, whether he was willing to believe the sacraments of the Church of Rome as we believe, and as the Church of Rome preaches and observes? he answered, that he believes nothing but what he had said before. These things he deposed at Toulouse before Brother Laurence of Orleans, and the foresaid Brother John Vigorosus the Inquisitor, in the presence of the witnesses Brother Arnold Del Gras, Brother Bertrand James, and Brother Raymond Navarr, of the order of Friars Preachers, and of Julian Vascon, public notary of Toulouse, who wrote this."

The letter which Mr. G. writ to my friend concluded with these words:

"I must not forget to tell you, that, according to my copy, the Albigenses said of themselves, that they were *de illis qui non reddebant malum pro malo*; (of those who did not render evil for evil;) that *boni homines* (good men) were their ministers. The formality they observed when they made a proselyte was this, *Haereticaverunt eum, ponentes librum et manus super caput ejus, et interrogantes eum si volebat se reddere Deo et Evangelio*: They made him a heretic by laying a book and their hands upon his head, and asking him, whether he were willing to surrender himself to God and the Gospel. I have observed from several passages, that on this occasion they were used to read more particularly the Gospel according to St. John, and that after these solemnities the proselytes *adorabant dictos bonos homines, flexis ter genibus, dicendo, Benedicite; haereticis respondentibus, Deus vos benedicat*: (paid their reverence to these good men, by thrice bending of the knee, saying, Give us your blessing; the heretics answering, God bless you.) The Inquisitors call the proselytes, and those that are born Albigenses, heretics."

It is easy to judge by this specimen, that it is almost impossible to give any credit to the deposition of Inquisitors concerning the matters which, they say, they have made the Albigenses confess; and that therefore this pretended conviction of the Albigenses by the registers of the Inquisitors is absolutely null.

The second thing that I am to represent to the reader is, that the testimony of the Inquisitors cannot be set against the contrary confessions of the Albigenses, which those who have read find very conformable to the faith of the Protestants. This is that which Paradin affirms in his Annals of Burgundy, where he confesses that he has read some histories which excuse the Albigenses, with their princes and lords, of all those

crimes which many have cast upon them, affirming them to be wholly innocent, as having never done any thing else but reprove the vices and abuses of the Prelates of the Church of Rome.

This is also acknowledged by James de Ribera, in his *Collections concerning the city of Tholouse*.

"In these times there were frequent disputes held with the heretics several times at Viride Folium and at Pamiers; but the famous disputation was at Montreal, where two noblemen were chosen arbitrators, Bernardus de Villa Nova and Bernardus Arrensis; and two of the commons, Raimond Godius and Arnoldus Ribera; but they who were accounted heretics could not agree about any thing: the names of the chiefest of them were these; Ponticus Jordanus, Arnoldus Aurisanus, Arnoldus Othonus, Philibertus Casliensis, Benedictus Thermus. **They all constantly affirmed, that the Church of Rome was not the holy Church, nor the spouse of Christ, but a Church that had imbibed the doctrine of devils; that she was that Babylon which St. John describes in the Revelation, the mother of fornications and abominations, covered over with the blood of the saints;** that what the Church of Rome approved of was not approved by the Lord; that the mass was neither instituted by Christ, nor by his Apostles, but was merely a human invention."

The same hath been owned by Carolus Molineus, the glory of the bar of France, who declares that the Albigenses of Provence taught this very thing expressly, in the reign of Lewis XII. which was afterwards taught by those of the reformed religion in France. This testimony is alleged by Camerarius, in his *Historical Account of the Brethren of Bohemia*. This obliged Vignier, in his *Historical Library*, to condemn all the calumnies cast upon the Albigenses. In his account of the year 1206, he relates, that a Gascon, a man of reputation, assured him, that he had read one of their confessions in the old Gascon language, which was preached before the late Chancellor de l'Hospital, a little before the second troubles of France, which had not one word of these opinions, but only those articles which we formerly ascribed to the Waldenses. Amongst which they expressly declared that they received the canonical books of the Old and New Testament, and **that they rejected every doctrine that was not grounded upon, or authorized by them, or was contrary to any one point of doctrine that may be found there.** According to which maxim, they confessed that they rejected and condemned all the ceremonies, traditions, and ordinances of the Church of Rome, which they declared to be a den of thieves, and **the whole that is spoken of in the Revelation.** Upon which account also, the colloquies, disputes, and conferences, which the legates of the Pope and their commissioners had together, were only upon these points, as we shall prove by the testimony of James de Ribera, in his book, entitled, his *Collections about the city of Tholouse*.

The third thing that we are to observe is, that this conformity of faith between the Waldenses and the Albigenses has made many people take them for the very same.

I suppose there is no reader that is ever so little just, but will allow me to make a very great difference between the accounts of the Inquisitors and the truth. The Inquisitors make the Albigenses guilty of the errors of the Cathari and Manichees, as if they had been all one, and that they had exactly answered the description which is given us of them in the Directory of the Inquisitors, by Emericus. But we have other ways of knowing, from their own confessions of faith, that they were not at all polluted by Manicheism; and the most part of those authors that have writ with any degree of honesty, call them Waldenses, because they held the same faith and opinions.

The same authors acknowledge, that it was against the Waldenses that St. Bernard preached in Languedoc; and that it is with them, whom they promiscuously call Albigenses, that those conferences were held, which the Bishop of Meaux owns to have been held with the Albigenses. This is acknowledged by James de Ribera, Counsellor of State, in his *Collections concerning the City of Tholouse*, that are set down in the catalogue of the Witnesses of the Truth. This is owned by Gretzer the Jesuit, in his *Prolegomena* to the authors who have written concerning the sect of the Waldenses; where he acknowledgeth that the Waldenses and Albigenses were the same, and were called *insabbatati*, because of their shoes; and that the Albigenses and Waldenses differ only in their names. Cardinal Hosius also had the same notion of them, in his book concerning the sacrament of the Eucharist, where he speaks of the Henricians and Petrobusians. This was the opinion of Andrew Favin, in his *History of Navarre*; where he saith, that the heresy of the Albigenses is otherwise termed the heresy of the Waldenses. Genebrard, in his *Chronology*, saith expressly, that the Fathers of the Calvinists were the Petrobusians, the Henricians, and the Albigenses; and

it is well known, that the Calvinists are no Manichees. Catel, in his *History of Tholouse*, acknowledgeth that the Henricians were the forerunners of the Albigenses, and that they had not this name till after the Council of Alby, in the year 1178.

CHAPTER 19

Whether the Albigenses were Manichees, because they accused the Pope of being the Antichrist.

As one day gives light to another, so the Bishop of Meaux hath at last discovered that the accusation charged upon the Pope by the Albigenses, as being the Antichrist, was a character of Manicheism. He thought fit to reveal this great secret to the world in his History of the Variations; and afterwards he makes it an express character of Manicheism, in his explication of the Revelation. But saving the reverence due to this Prelate, there is nothing falser, nothing that seems more to be raving.

For, 1. Hath he found this character of the Manichees in the writings of Archelaus, Bishop of Mesopotamia, which the late Mr. Bigosa hath communicated to the public; or in St. Cyril of Jerusalem, who confutes the Manichees in his catechetic lectures?

2. Hath he found any thing like it in the writings of St. Epiphanius, who hath given us so large a catalogue of their heresies?

3. Hath he found any thing to this purpose in St. Augustin, who hath writ so many books against these madmen; or in St. Leo, in his Epistle to Turribius, Bishop of Tarracon?

4. Hath he found any such thing in the treatise of Predestinatus concerning heresies, published by Sirmondus?

5. Hath he found this character of the Manichees in any of those authors that have written since; as in Isidore of Seville, in Johannes Damascenus, in the Catalogue of Heresies, published by Cotelierius?

6. Hath he found any thing to this purpose in Petrus Siculus, who lived in the ninth century, and who conversed and disputed at Tibrica with the Manichees, whose opinions he sets down?

All the Greek authors which speak of the Manichees before and after the ninth century, and all the Latin authors, without so much as excepting one only, know of no such thing: who could therefore discover this character of Manicheism to the Bishop?

We must conclude that the Bishop, who hath made a discovery which none of the ancients, no, nor modern writers neither, whether Papists or Protestants, have been able to make, must have had it from the revelation of some angel, *albus an ater nescio*, since he speaks so very positively of this new character of the Manichees.

But, saith he, the case is plain, the Albigenses were Manichees, and **they called the Pope the Anti-christ**, and with an invincible obstinacy have maintained that this title belongs to him; wherefore it must follow, that this accusation of the Pope must be a character of Manicheism. If the Bishop had reflected never so little upon what he here asserts, this single character of the Albigenses, who accused the Pope of being the Anti-christ, would have made him draw a quite contrary consequence; that is to say, that the Albigenses could not be Manichees.

For it is most certain, that the Manichees never taught any such thing: this heresy, which sprung up in the east, never attacked the Bishop of Rome in particular, but the whole body of Christians who received the books of the Old Testament, and who owned the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ to be the Creator of the world.

But whence comes it then, may some say, that the Albigenses have peculiarly affected to call the Pope Antichrist? which certainly must be looked upon a character of the Albigenses, unless we should find it to be a character of the Manichees, as the Bishop of Meaux pretends.

The question would not have been so difficult to resolve, had not the Bishop affected to appear ignorant in a question which he ought to have inquired into, since he hath undertaken to handle it in a commentary on purpose.

In a word, France, which first bestowed upon the Popes the temporal dominions they now enjoy, long since owned the Pope to be the Antichrist. For Gregory I. having declared, in twelve several letters written against the Patriarch of Constantinople, who assumed the title of Universal Bishop, that whoever claimed that title for himself was either the Antichrist, or the forerunner of him; it was not long after, that Pope Boniface III. persuaded Phocas to give him the title of Universal, which all his successors took up afterwards with joy, and affected to use it: for which reason the French, fearing lest they should fail of the respect which they had for St. Gregory, if they should accuse themselves of having so often made use of a false way of reasoning, at last called the Pope Antichrist.

They were not therefore Manichees that were come from the east, in the eleventh century, to settle themselves in the West, who first set on foot this accusation; but they were the French, who, in a full council at Rheims, after the tenth century, called the Pope Antichrist.

Seguinus, Archbishop of Sens, having maintained that Arnulphus, Bishop of Rheims, could not be deposed without the consent of the Pope; Arnulphus, Bishop of Orleans, who had the greatest reputation of any man of his time, solidly maintained, from the canons and customs of the Church, that the Pope's sentence was not to be waited for in that case; *Ab eo responsa petere, marmora consulere est*; "To desire an answer from him, is to consult the stones;" speaking to the assembly of the Council.

He further saith, "Who do you think that man is, who sits in his high chair? he is, answers he, the Antichrist, who sits in the temple of God, and shews himself as God."

And the rest of his discourse is a sufficient evidence that he took the Pope to be the Antichrist, and that he acknowledged that the mystery of iniquity was then coming in upon the Church. It was Gerbertus, afterwards Pope, that digested the acts of that Council, and who, in an epistle to Seguinus, Archbishop of Sens, makes it appear, that in his time they were not much concerned for the Pope's excommunications, and that it was not pretended that he was the center of Christian communion. *Non est ergo (says he) danda occasio nostris aemulis, ne sacerdotium, quod ubique unum est, sicut Ecclesia una est, ita uni subijci videatur, ut eo pecunia, gratia, metu, vel ignorantia corrupto, nemo Sacerdos esse possit, nisi quem hae virtutes commendaverint*: "We ought not therefore to give an opportunity to our rivals, lest the priesthood, which is everywhere one and the same, as the Church is one, should come to be so subjected to one, as that he being corrupted with money, favour, fear, or ignorance, no man should be able to obtain that order, except he had these virtues to recommend him."

Here we see the true style of the Albigenses, before ever any Manichee was come from the east into France.

Now after this was once set on foot, it was maintained from century to century by those who were brought up and that died in the communion of the Church of Rome. It would be an easy matter to give a catalogue of those who have spoke at this rate, to show what heed there is to be given to the most positive assertions of the Bishop of Meaux.

If the Bishop of Meaux, in the least desired to undeceive himself, he need only read what Aventinus says, in his Annals of Bavaria, of Pope Gregory VII. who there is termed Antichrist by persons who were very far from being Manichees: he need only read, in the Acts of the Life of Paschal II. what the Bishop of Florence openly preached concerning this matter; or to read in the Life of Richard I. written by Roger Hoveden, what Abbot Joachim maintained before Richard I. without being ever accused of Manicheism: or he may take notice in Matthew Paris, upon the year 1253, what notions Robert Grossthead, Bishop of Lincoln, one of the greatest Bishops of his time, maintained: or he may peruse the Revelations of St. Brigit, and the 16th

Epistle of Petrarch, in his second tome. And yet never were any of these persons accused of Manicheism. But this has been treated of at large already by Wolfius in his Various Lections; and besides, this would lead us too far from the subject we are upon at present. I shall content myself therefore with observing three things concerning this matter.

The first is, that nothing was more common with the Popes and Antipopes, than mutually to brand each other with the title of Antichrist: and the writers of both parties kept always close to this style, and yet all of them lived and died in the bosom of the Church of Rome, and never were thought to be the disciples of the Manichees.

Secondly, That there are many authors, and even several of those that have been canonized, who have made use of the same notions in speaking and writing of the Church of Rome, and yet none have ever condemned them of Manicheism.

The third is, That ever since the Reformation, though the Bishop pretends that the prophecy concerning the beast hath been already fulfilled; there is scarcely (if you except the Bishop) any one Popish author, who doth not own that Rome is to be the seat of Antichrist.

What I say now deserves to be considered, because in the year 1516, December the 19th, in the 11th session of the Lateran Council, under Leo X. in whose time Luther began to preach, we find that there was a prohibition against handling the question of Antichrist in the pulpit, though under the pretense of advancing some new revelation concerning it, without having obtained leave from the holy see, or from the Bishop. The words of the canon which oblige all those who should ever undertake to preach on this subject are these:

"And we command all who bear this charge, or who shall bear it for the future, that they preach and explain the evangelical truth and the holy Scripture, according to the exposition and interpretation of those Doctors, whom the Church or long tradition has approved, and has hitherto allowed to be read, or which shall be so for time to come, without adding any thing that is contrary to, or disagreeing from the proper sense of them, but that they always insist upon such matters as do not disagree with the words of the Scripture, nor with the interpretations of the foresaid Doctors. Neither let them presume to fix in their sermons any certain time of the evils to come, of the coming of Antichrist, or of the day of judgment; forasmuch as truth assures us, that it is not for us to know the times and seasons. Moreover, if the Lord should be pleased to reveal to any of them in the Church of God future things by some inspiration, as he hath promised by the Prophet Amos; and seeing the Apostle Paul saith, Despise not prophesying, etc. we will not have such as these reckoned amongst impostors and liars, or that they shall be any ways hindered: but because it is a matter of great moment, and that we are not upon light grounds to believe every spirit, but are to try them whether they be of God; we command that by a constant law any such asserted inspirations, before they be published or preached to the people, be henceforward understood to be reserved to the examination of the apostolical see. But in case this cannot be done without the danger of too long a delay, or that urgent necessity should otherwise persuade; then, observing the same order, it may be signified to the ordinary of the place, who taking along with him three or four learned and grave men, and diligently examining the matter with them, if they see it expedient (which we charge upon their consciences) they may grant them liberty: but whosoever presumes to commit any thing contrary to the premises, shall incur excommunication, from the which he shall not be absolved but by the Pope himself; that so by their example others may be deterred from presuming to do any such thing; for which reason we decree that they be for ever made incapable of the office of preaching, any privileges whatsoever to the contrary notwithstanding," etc.

It is not our business to examine the question, whether the Bishop of Meaux hath exactly followed the rules that this canon prescribes, in his explication of the Scripture, and especially about the matter of Antichrist, though they be rules by which Bishops are no less bound than the meanest divines. It may be the Church of Rome finds the Bishop's new system so much for her interest, that it inclines her to suspend the severity of her canons, in favor of a person who has so dexterously plucked a thorn out of her foot, which hath troubled her so long, and which hath always caused new pains to her, as oft as any of her doctors have endeavored to pluck it out.

But I fear I have insisted too long upon so vain a conjecture, and which scarce deserved to be confuted. There are able men of the Church of Rome, who have taken the pains to refute the conjecture of some Papists who would needs have Mahomet to be the Antichrist: this was the chimera of Annius of Viterbo, a Monk famous for his impostures; this likewise was the whimsey of Fevardentius and some others, whom Pererius, the Jesuit, hath refuted so solidly, as that he has put the Bishop of Meaux to the trouble of inventing a new system to oppose the Protestants. I hope his system will meet with the same destiny amongst his own party, that so the Protestants may not be put to the trouble of giving it a formal confutation. For indeed, though the politics of the Church of Rome do bear with several opinions that differ from the common hypotheses of their society, yet the divines of that party are not patient enough to dissemble the dislike they have to see their old opinions, which have been maintained for several ages, trod under foot. The Bishop himself has all example hereof, which he cannot well have forgot, in the person of Cardinal Capizucchi, who, having given his approbation to the exposition of the Romish faith, made by the Bishop of Meaux, in which he sweetens the worship of images so very much, for fear of incensing the Protestants, whom he designed to bring over to his own side, was not wanting some years after to publish a treatise, wherein he shews that he gave that approbation, only upon the account of reason of state, and not because he sincerely approved the way which the Bishop had taken to make the worship of images appear more tolerable to the Protestant party.

CHAPTER 20

Of the morals of the Albigenses, and of their ecclesiastical government.

Having thus justified the Albigenses as to their doctrine and worship, it is time now to proceed to shew the regularity of their discipline, by representing the nature of their Church government, and the conduct of those Churches in matters that related to their manners. This will not be a matter of any difficulty; for it is easily conceived that these dioceses being stored with people who maintained the doctrine of Berengarius, as the Abbot of Tron tells us, they had a great party of the Clergy at the head of them. I do not say this without good grounds; for, first, we see that in the councils held against Berengarius, there were very great contests about this matter, and that the opposite party carried their point only by downright violence. Secondly, That, according to the testimony of Sigebert, if many persons wrote against Berengarius, many also wrote in favor of him, and who can doubt of their being Churchmen? Thirdly, That his own Bishop Bruno, Bishop of Angers, where he was Archdeacon, declared himself for him. Fourthly, That in Aquitaine, in the year 1075, Giraldus, Legate of Pope Gregory VII. was obliged to call a council at Poitiers, where Berengarius narrowly escaped being murdered, as we are assured by the *Chronicle of St. Maixant*, the circumstances whereof, there set down, they that published it took care to leave out. Fifthly, That five years after they were obliged to convocate another council at Bourdeaux, where Berengarius gave an account of his faith, as the same *Chronicle* acquaints us. We ought naturally to observe that from the year 1050, wherein Berengarius appeared at Rome, where he maintained his opinions with so much courage, that Leo of Ostia, Abbot of Mont-Cassin, owns that there was nobody able to oppose him, until the year 1080, in which the Council of Bourdeaux met; the Church of Rome could not overthrow Berengarius's party, though she had employed by turns both councils and violence, which shews that there were amongst Berengarius's followers a considerable party of the Clergy, and of those of Aquitaine in particular. Neither was it only this difference in point of doctrine that strengthened the Berengarian party, but also the regulations of Pope Nicholas II. and his successors; and, above all, those of Gregory VII. in the Council of Rome, in 1074. and 1075. We may see the effect of his prohibiting matrimony to Priests, as Sigebert has recorded it upon the year 1074.

"Gregory the Pope," saith he, "at a synod held by him, anathematized all that came into preferments by simony, and removed all married Priests from their functions, and forbad laymen to assist at their masses, by not only an unheard of precedent, but also (as several people thought at that time) by an inconsiderate prejudice, contrary to the opinion of the holy Fathers, who have written, that the sacraments used in the Church, to wit, baptism, chrism, and the body and blood of our Lord, have the selfsame efficacy by the secret operation of the Holy Ghost, be the dispensers of them good or bad. Wherefore then, since they are quickened by the Holy Spirit, so that they are neither amplified by the worthiness of the good dispensers, nor lessened by the sins of the wicked, whence is this man that baptizes? which thing hath given so great occasion of scandal, that never was the holy Church rent with a more dangerous schism at any time by a prevailing heresy than it is now, whilst some act for righteousness, others against it; some openly are guilty of simony, others cover the stain of covetousness with an honest name, selling that under the name of charity, which they pretend to give freely, as Eusebius saith of the Montanists, whilst under the name of offerings, they more artificially receive bribes. By this means also things are brought to that pass, that there are very few that practice continence, whilst some make only an hypocritical shew of it for gain and boasting; and others aggravate their incontinence by forswearing themselves, and by multiplied adulteries. Besides, upon this occasion laymen rise up in rebellion against the holy orders of the Church, shaking off the yoke of ecclesiastical subjection; laymen profane holy mysteries, and dispute about them, baptize infants, using the filthy excrement of the ears, instead of the holy oil and chrism; on their death-beds they scorn to receive at the hands of married Priests the Lord's provision for their last journey, and the usual service of Church burial. The tithes that are assigned to the Priests they consume with fire: and that by one horrid profanation you may make an estimate of the rest, laymen have been often seen to trample the body of our Lord, that had been consecrated by married Priests, under their feet, and wilfully spill his blood upon the ground; and many such things against the laws of God and man are daily committed in the Church. By this means also many false teachers rise in the Church, who, by their profane innovations, alienate the minds of the common people from the discipline of the Church."

This therefore was the great occasion that was given to many of the Clergy and people of Aquitain, not to entertain any communion with the Church of Rome, or to submit themselves to the yoke which she was preparing for all the western Churches.

I have, in my Remarks upon the History of the Churches of Piedmont, given an account of the rise of the opinion of those who believed that the Pope's excommunications deprived such as had been duly ordained, of all power to exercise their functions, and did incapacitate them to confer orders upon other ministers. This was the true reason that made all that maintained the principles of the Church of Rome look upon the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, who had thus renounced the Roman communion, as a company of laymen, and to consider their ordinations as null. I need not repeat the same here, it being sufficiently confirmed by the passage of Sigebert, which I just now quoted.

It appears therefore that the discipline of the Albigenses was the same that had been practiced in the primitive Church: they had their Bishops, their Priests, and their Deacons, whom the Church of Rome at first held for schismatics, and whose ministry she at last absolutely rejected, for the same reasons that made her consider the ministry of the Waldenses as null and void. We find in Peter, the Abbot of Clugny, that he reproacheth the Petrobusians for being joined with schismatics; whereas they took the name of apostolical men. See how he speaks to them: *Vos magistri errorum, et caeci duces caecorum, faeces haeresium, et reliquiae schismaticorum!* "O you masters of errors, and blind leaders of the blind, the dregs of heresies, and the relics of schismatics!"

Who were these schismatics but the Berengarians? It is manifest that union with the Church of Rome being become impossible, by reason of the errors she had defined, and the tyranny she had usurped over the State and Church; there was even before his time a separation made of the greatest part of the dioceses of Narbon, Toulouse, Agen, and other places; and that Peter Bruys and his disciples were of his party, appears from his 2d Epistle, which is considerable, to this purpose.

"In your parts," saith he "the people are re-baptized, the churches profaned, the altars overthrown, crosses burnt, and flesh eaten on the very day of our Saviour's passion; Priests are whipped, Monks imprisoned, and forced by terrors and torments to marry. The heads of which contagion you have indeed by the Divine assistance, and the help of Catholic princes, driven out of your country; but the members, as I have already said, remain yet amongst you, infected with this deadly poison, as I myself lately perceived."

By which passage we find that the same disorders had happened in those dioceses which he speaks of, that Sigebert had before observed. Bouchet, in his Annals of Aquitain, understands the thing after the same manner, where he speaks thus of the voyage of St. Bernard.

"In the mean time, whilst all these things were a doing, Godfry, Bishop of Chartres, and Innocent's legate in France, and St. Bernard, who were employed to purge the schismatics out of Aquitain, or to reduce them to the union of the Church, went first to Nantes," etc.

I have shewed how Henry opposed himself to the abuses and superstitions which the Church of Rome endeavored to introduce into these dioceses. But whatever efforts the Romish party made use of to overthrow this happy work, it seems that they could never attain their end. We have a letter writ by an Earl of Toulouse to the Abbot of Cisteaux, and to the general Chapter of that order, in the year 1177, which declares that the Clergy sided with the party which he accuseth of Manicheism; and that the Popish churches were reduced to extreme desolation, he himself being in no condition to remedy it, or to oppose himself against the torrent, most of the great Lords having declared themselves for them.

"So far," saith he, "hath this noisome heretical infection prevailed, that almost all closing with it believe that in so doing they do God good service; and the wicked one, who is now exerting the mystery of iniquity in the children of unbelief, doth so transform himself into an angel of light, that the wife separates from her husband, the son from his father, and the daughter-in-law from her mother-in-law. And, O miserable! has the gold lost its lustre amongst us to that degree, that it is trod under the Devil's feet like dirt? for even the Priests are depraved with the filth of heresy; and the ancient and once venerable churches appointed for worship, are left desolate, and lie in ruins. - And now what shall I say? there are none that

consider with themselves, and say in their hearts, What do we do? for we see that these men do a great deal of mischief. If we let them alone, all men will believe in them; and he who hath swallowed down a river already, will not wonder at it, from the boldness of his wicked Presumption, if Jordan should flow into his mouth. For my part, who am girt with one of the two divine swords, and who do own myself an avenger of the divine wrath, and minister of God appointed for that purpose, whilst I endeavor to set bounds, and put a stop to this infidelity, do find that my power is too weak to effect such and so great a work, because the most part of the gentry of my dominion, having drunk of this poison of infidelity already, are wasted away with its contagion, and together with them, the greatest part of the common people, fallen from the faith, pines likewise; so that I neither dare nor am able to undertake it."

Roger Hoveden sets down a letter of Peter, Cardinal Legate at Toulouse, wherein he makes mention of the Albigensian Pastors, Raymond Baimiac, Bernard Raimond, and some other chief heretics, who came to speak with him, under his and the Earl of Toulouse's safe conduct, and made profession of their faith in a great assembly in the Church of St. Stephen.

He afterwards gives us an account of a letter of Henry Abbot, of Clairvaux, who, lamenting the corruption of Toulouse, by these arch-heretics, adds these words:

"Yea, so far had this plague prevailed in the land, that they had not only made to themselves Priests and Bishops, but had also their Evangelists, who, having depraved and cancelled the truth of the Gospel, had copied to themselves new Gospels, and from their wicked hearts preached to the deceived people new doctrines. I lie, if there was not amongst them a man of a great age, of a very plentiful estate, who had several brethren and friends, and who had the reputation of a great man amongst the greatest of the city, whom, in punishment for his sins, the Devil had so blinded, that he declared himself to be John the Evangelist, and he distinguished the Word that was in the beginning with God, from another principle of things, as from another God. He was the head of these miserable wretches, and the ringleader of the heretics in this city; who, though a layman and an idiot, and so knew nothing, yet, as a fountain of diabolical wisdom, the bitter waters of perdition and death flowed from him amongst them. A company of dark owls associated to him at nights, where he, sitting amongst them in a garment like a rochet, and a surplice over it, seemed like a king with his army standing about him, and was the preacher to these fools. He had filled the whole city with his disciples and doctrine; nobody daring to oppose him, because of his power and riches. Yea, so great was the licentiousness of these heretics, that at our entrance into the town, as we passed through the streets and lanes, they mocked us, and pointed at us with their finger, calling us apostates, hypocrites, and heretics."

Peter, Monk of Vaux Cernay, owns that the Albigenses had their teachers, whom they called Bishops and Deacons. He takes notice that the Earl of Toulouse, who never went any whither without a New Testament, had always with him some of these ministers for his instruction and consolation.

We find in the Council of Montpellier, in the year 1214, that there was some difference between the heretics that were the pastors, and the believers, that is to say, the people; as it is particularly taken notice of in the Preface, and in the 29th Canon of the Council of Gallia Narbonensis. We find in Matthew Paris a letter of the Bishop of Porto, the Pope's Legate for this business of the Albigenses, written in the year 1223, to the Archbishop of Roan, where he mentions one Bartholomew, a Bishop of the heretics, who had removed himself into the country near Toulouse, where he created Bishops, and set rules to the churches of his communion. His words are these: *Etenim de Carcassona oriundus, vices illius Antipapae gerens, Bartholomaeus haereticorum Episcopus, funestam ei exhibendo reverentiam, sedem et locum concessit in villa quae Perlos appellatur, et seipsum transtulit in partes Tholosanas. Iste Bartholomaeus, in literarum suarum undique discurrentium tenore, se in primo salutationis alloquio intitulat in hunc modum, Bartholomaeus servus servorum sanctae fidei, tali salutem. Ipse etiam inter alias enormitates creat Episcopos, et Ecclesias perfide ordinare intendit.*

"For this Bartholomew, the Bishop of the heretics, Vicar to that Antipope, originally of Carcasson, paying him an unhappy reverence, yielded him his seat and his place in the village called Perlos, and removed himself into the country near Toulouse. This Bartholomew styled himself servant of the servants of the holy faith, and in his letters which he sent about amongst his flock, as also in his first salutations of those

who addressed themselves to him, he always assumed that character. He also added to his other crimes that of creating Bishops, and perfidiously took upon him the government of those churches."

Lucas Tudensis speaks of one of their Bishops that was burnt. William of Puylaurens, in his Chronicle, at the beginning, speaks of the great respect that was given to these ministers of the Albigenses, whom he calls Waldenses, because of the holiness of their lives.

Lastly, we see in the Acts of the Inquisition of Toulouse several names of those that were pastors of the Albigenses, and who had been ordained to the holy ministry by men of their own communion. This therefore was the government of these churches, the succession whereof we cannot distinctly set down; but this ought not to surprise any body: the captains of the croisade, and the Inquisitors, can best satisfy the world in this point, wherein we must acknowledge our inability.

As for their morals and behavior, who ever will but reflect upon the debauchery and general corruption which reigned in the eleventh century, will easily judge, that those who renounced the communion of the Church of Rome, and who called her the mystical Babylon, because of her false worship, and the horrid corruption of her ministers, must needs be more pure in their morals, and more orderly in their behavior; and indeed we find it true in the Albigenses, as well pastors as people.

The pastors recommended to the people the having of the books of the New Testament in their mother-tongue, and pressed the reading thereof with so much care and application, that Raymond, Earl of Toulouse, never stirred any whither without taking that holy book with him. This was the certain badge and mark of all these heretics, and that whereby they defended themselves. For which reason, the Council of Toulouse, fearing lest their croisades should not be able to exterminate the Albigenses, as long as they had the Bible in the vulgar tongue, took care to prohibit the having of it in these terms;

"We prohibit the permission of the books of the Old and New Testament to laymen, except perhaps they might desire to have the Psalter, or some Breviary for the divine service, or the Hours of the blessed Virgin Mary, for devotion; expressly forbidding their having the other parts of the Bible translated into the vulgar tongue."

It was by means of this purity of their morals, that, as Petrus Cluniacensis witnesseth, the Petrobusians found so much favour with many of the Clergy, of the Bishops, of the Princes, and of the laity, at the same time when they preached openly, that the Church of Rome was not the Church; but that they were the true Church, as being truly apostolical.

Indeed a cursory reflection upon the nature of the enormous crimes laid to their charge, as if those abominations had been the general character of their religion, is sufficient to discover the imposture of their accusers: for they are crimes that overturn the foundations of all society, by destroying the honor of families, and filling every place with abominable adulteries and incests. Can any man imagine that such a sect as this could ever have been able to propagate itself throughout all Europe, as Wilhelmus Newbrigenis declares the Waldenses did, if the manners of those that profess it had been founded upon principles that trample upon the laws of nature, which have always been respected even amidst the thickest darkness of Paganism? We do not find that Manicheism went so far, even then when it caused the greatest disturbance in the world, nor that the corruption into which it plunged those that were tainted with it had any very great influence upon others: whereas we find, that the religion of the Albigenses hath spread its roots far and near, and even procured esteem and affection from those of the Romish party that were not wholly transformed into the nature of brutes and madmen, being natural consequences of that insulting spirit which has animated the Popes and the Clergy in these latter ages.

What I say here is evident from the testimony of William of Puylaurens, in his Chronicle, who owns that the Albigenses had a show of godliness, though, saith he, they denied the power of it; that they were had in extreme veneration by the people; and that more legacies were left to them than to Churchmen: whereas, on the other hand, the Romish Clergy were fallen to that extreme contempt, that laymen, instead of the common wish, I had rather be a Jew, used to say, I had rather be a Chaplain.

The case must needs have been very evident; since Pope Innocent III. who left nothing unattempted to root it out, yet could not but do them the justice to own, that they were very free from several vices.

Indeed we may easily judge of their morals and demeanour, by their constancy in suffering the most cruel torments in the defense of the truth. Matthew Paris tells us of one Robert, an Inquisitor, who buried alive, or burnt, fifty of them in two months' time; and yet not one of them renounced his faith, in the midst of the greatest violence of their torments. Perrin and Chassagnon give us great numbers of parallel examples, as well as the Acts of the Inquisition of Toulouse. Lucus Tudensis, who endeavours to ridicule this constancy of their martyrs, is at the same time a witness for it, beyond all manner of controversy.

Mezeray was juster than the Bishop of Meaux; for though he was not ignorant of the slanders cast upon them, yet he hath given this testimony, of the Albigenses, whom he calls Waldenses: he saith, "There were two principal sorts of them; the one of them were very ignorant, and given to lewdness and villany: these men maintained gross and filthy errors; and these were indeed a kind of Manichees. The others were more learned, and less disorderly, and keeping themselves at the greatest distance from the filthinesses now mentioned, maintained much the same opinions with the Calvinists, and, to speak properly, were Henricians and Waldenses."

This testimony, so agreeable to truth, may well make those blush who copy the forgeries of the Jesuit Mariana, who, to make the Albigenses pass for Atheists and Epicureans, has changed the title of Lucus Tudensis's book, which was only in these terms, *Concerning another Life, and Controversies of Faith*, by adding to it, against the errors of the Albigenses.

CHAPTER 21

Concerning the persecutions which the Albigenses have suffered from the Pope and his party.

My design is not to enlarge here upon a particular description of their persecutions. This would be too vast a field to enter upon in a work of this kind which I have undertaken: but withal, I should think myself to blame, if, after having shewed with how much zeal the Albigenses maintained the truth of the Gospel by their preaching, and practiced the morals thereof in their conversation, I should not give a short account of what persecutions they have suffered, and with what constancy, by their martyrdom, they have borne witness to the same truth.

We have already taken a view of the persecutions exercised against Peter de Bruis and Henry his disciple, at the solicitation of Peter de Clugny, and Bernard, Abbot of Clairvaux, who caused them to be sacrificed to the interest of the Church of Rome, which, after the eleventh century, begun to persecute with sword and fire all those who durst be so bold to oppose her greatness by undervaluing her decrees. It was in compliance with this method, that Petrus Cluniacensis, writing to the Archbishop of Arles and Ambrun, and to the Bishops of Die and Gap, concerning the Petrobusians and Henricians, tells them,

"It is your duty to drive out the heretics from those places, (where they rejoice to have found lurking-holes,) not only by your preaching, but also, if need be, by armed force of laymen."

The Council of Toulouse, assembled in 1119, where Calixtus II. was present, gave occasion to these bloody executions. The third chapter enjoins all powers to repress the heretics, and that those that favor them be subject to the same condemnation.

In the year 1163 the Council of Tours, assembled by Alexander III. had ordained, that the Bishops of those provinces, where any of them were found, should not suffer any one to harbour or shelter them; that no commerce should be held with them about the things of common conversation; and ordered temporal princes to imprison and condemn them, and confiscate their estates and goods.

In the year 1179 the same Pope Alexander III. renewed the same orders, forbidding also their being buried in places set apart for the burial of Papists.

In 1181 Henry, who, from Abbot of Clairvaux, had been made Bishop of Alby, having, as Legate, gathered together some considerable forces by his preaching, went to visit them with armed force; but they, to avoid the storm that threatened them, pretended to abjure their errors: but no sooner was the storm blown over, but they lived as they did before. So that the contagion spread itself through several provinces on both sides of the Loire: and one of their false apostles, called Terric, who had hid himself a long time in a cave at Corbigny in the diocese of Nevers, was taken and burnt; and many more suffered the same punishment in several other places.

This was that sweetness of the Church of Rome, which the Bishop of Meaux so much boasts of, and which she put in practice long before she came to conferences, which served only for a prelude to the utter ruin of the Albigenses, which the Popes had designed long before.

Accordingly Innocent III. as Mezeray tells us in the History of Philip Augustus, finding himself unable to reduce the heretics of Languedoc, who had almost gained that whole province, resolved to make an example of Raymond, Earl of Toulouse, because he was their chief favourer, and because he had caused Peter de Chasteauneuf, a Cistercian Monk, and the first that ever exercised the function of Inquisitor, to be put to death: he excommunicated the Earl, absolved his subjects from their oath of allegiance, and gave his lands to the first that should seize them, yet so as without prejudice to the right of sovereignty of the kings of

France. Whereupon the Earl was so frightened, that being come to Valence, to meet with Milo, the Pope's Legate, he wholly submitted himself to him, and gave eight strong places for ever to the Church of Rome, as a security of his conversion; and the year following, to obtain absolution, he suffered himself to be lashed with rods before the gate of the church of St. Giles, where Peter de Chasteauneuf was buried, and afterwards to be dragged to the tomb of that Monk by the Legate, who put a wooden yoke about his neck, before twenty Archbishops and an infinite multitude of people: after this he took upon him the croisade, and the year following joined himself with those that took his own cities, and those of his confederates. But it was not his repentance that engaged him to endure so dreadful a disgrace, but the apprehension he had of a terrible tempest that was just then breaking over his head: for the Pope turning his torrent of zeal against the heretics, which pushed the people on to the deliverance of the Holy Land, had this same year ordered the croisade to be preached up against the Albigenses, and a great number of noblemen, bishops, and common people, had already listed themselves in that service, the King himself furnishing fifteen thousand men, maintained at his own charges.

It is worth our taking notice, first, that Pope Innocent III. to encourage the lords and people to the holy war, granted a plenary remission of all their sins to all those who took up the badge of the cross, vouchsating also the protection of the holy see to their persons and goods, as may be seen in his Epistles. He absolved the cities that had sworn to the Earl of Toulouse from their oath of allegiance, upon that excellent principle of the Church of Rome, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, because they do not keep theirs with God or the Church. Secondly, that the Earl of Toulouse was not guilty of the murder of Peter de Chasteau Neuf; for we read, that Earl Raymond went to meet King Philip, to obtain of him letters of recommendation from the Pope, that he might be fully acquitted of the murder of the Monk Peter de Chasteau Neuf, whereof they had most unjustly obliged him to confess himself guilty, only because the said murder had been committed in his territories, for which the Legate Milo had imposed upon him a most unjust and unheard of penance. From the court of the King of France he went to Rome, where he received absolution immediately from the hands of Pope Innocent III. This being a case reserved to him, the Pope received him very civilly, presented him with a rich robe and a ring of great value, and granted him plenary remission and absolution from the said murder, declaring that he looked upon him as sufficiently cleared upon that account.

In the year 1209, the army of these crossed soldiers, which consisted of no less than five hundred thousand men, entered Languedoc, and attacked the city of Beziers, being one of the strongest places the Albigenses had, took it by force, and put all they found in it to the sword; so that above sixty thousand persons were killed there, as Mezeray informs us.

There happened one thing very remarkable at the taking of this city, which was, that the zeal of these consecrated soldiers was such, that they put to the sword all the Papists and Romish Clergy that were in the city. The Earl of Beziers came out of the city, and cast himself at the feet of the Legate Milo, begging his grace in behalf of his city of Beziers, and entreating him that he would not involve the innocent in the punishment of the guilty, which would certainly come to pass, in case the city should be taken by force, (which would soon be done by such a great and powerful army, that was ready to scale the walls in every part round the whole city:) that it could not be otherwise but that in this case much blood would be spilt on both sides, which he might prevent. That there were in Beziers great numbers of good Catholics, who would be involved in the same ruin, contrary to the Pope's intention, whose design was only to chastise the Albigenses. That if he did not think fit to spare his subjects for their own sakes, that at least he would be pleased to take pity of his age and profession, since the loss would be his, who was under age, and an obedient servant of the Pope, as having been educated in the Church of Rome, in the which he was resolved to live and die. That if he was offended that such persons as were enemies to the Pope had been tolerated in his territories, that this ought not to be imputed to him, because he had no other subjects but such as his deceased father had left him; and that in this his minority, and during the short time that he had been master of his estate, he had neither been able, by reason of his incapacity, to discern the evil, or to suit a remedy to it, though indeed this was his intention; and that he hoped, for the time to come, to give all manner of satisfaction to the Pope and the Church of Rome, as became an obedient son of both. The Pope's Legate's answer was, that all his excuses should be of no use to him, and that he might shift for himself the best he could.

The Earl of Beziers, being returned to the city, called the people together, and represented to them, that, after having submitted himself to the Pope's Legate, he had interceded for them, without being able to obtain any thing, but a pardon, upon condition that those who professed the faith of the Albigenses should abjure their religion, and promise to live according to the laws of the Church of Rome. The Roman Catholics beseeched them to give way to this extreme violence, and not to be the cause of their death, because the Legate was resolved not to pardon one of them, except they all unanimously resolved to live under the same laws. To which the Albigenses answered, that they would never forsake their faith for the base price of this frail life: that they were well assured that God could protect them, if it seemed good unto him; but withal, neither were they ignorant, that, if he rather chose to be glorified by the confession of their faith, it would be an exceeding honor to them to die for righteousness' sake: that they had much rather displease the Pope, who could only destroy their bodies, than offend God, who could destroy body and soul together: that they detested the thought of being ashamed of or denying that faith by which they had learned to know Christ and his righteousness; and for fear of eternal death to embrace a religion which entirely takes away the merit of Jesus Christ, and destroys his righteousness: that therefore they might make the best terms for themselves they could, without promising any thing that was contrary to the duty of true Christians.

As soon as the Roman Catholics understood this, they sent their Bishop to the Legate, to beseech him not to comprehend them in the same punishment with the Albigenses, they having always adhered to the Church of Rome, and of whom he who was their Bishop had good knowledge; judging also, that the rest had not gone so far from the ways of repentance, but that they might be reduced by a sweetness well becoming the Church, which takes no delight in shedding blood.

The Legate, being enraged at this, with horrible threats and oaths protested, that except all that were in the town did acknowledge their fault, and submit themselves to the Church of Rome, they should all be put to the sword, without any regard had to Catholics, to sex, or age, but that all should be exposed to fire and sword; and immediately commanded the city to be summoned to surrender at discretion: which being refused, he commanded all the warlike engines to play, and to discharge their instruments, and to cast stones, ordering them at the same time to give a general assault, and to scale the city round, so that it was impossible for those within to sustain the shock: for being pressed upon by above an hundred thousand pilgrims, they at last, saith the compiler of the Treasure of Histories, discomfited those within the city, and entering in all at once, killed vast numbers of all sorts, and afterwards putting fire to the city, they burnt it to ashes.

When the town was taken, the Priests, Monks, and Clerks came in procession out of the great church of Beziers, called St. Nazari, with the banner, cross, and holy water, bareheaded, clothed in their ecclesiastical vestments, singing Te Deum, in token of their rejoicing for the city's being taken and purged of the Albigenses. But the pilgrims, who had received an express order from the Legate to kill all, rushed in amongst this procession, cutting off the heads and arms of the Priests, striving who could do most, till they were all cut to pieces.

These cruelties exercised upon the city of Beziers, upon the Papists themselves, yea, and upon their very Clergy, having opened the Earl of Beziers's eyes to see that the Pope, under the pretense of religion, had a mind to ruin the Earl of Toulouse, his uncle, as well as himself, he shut up himself in his city of Carcasson, with a resolution to defend it against the Legate and his pilgrims. The King of Arragon, his kinsman, having discoursed with him, the Earl plainly declared, that he knew this to be the Pope's design, because when he was treating for his subjects of Beziers, he refused to receive his Catholic subjects into his favor, nay, would not so much as spare the Priests, who were all cut in pieces in their sacerdotal ornaments, under the banner and the cross; that this example of cruel impiety, joined with what they exercised upon the village of Carcasson, where they had exposed all to fire and sword, without any distinction of age or sex, had fully convinced him that there was no mercy to be looked for from the Legate or his pilgrims; and that accordingly he would choose rather to die with his subjects, defending themselves, than to be exposed to the mercy of an inexorable enemy, such as he had found the Legate to be: and though there were in the city of Carcasson many of his subjects of a belief contrary to that of the Church of Rome, yet that they were persons that had never done any injury to any one; that they had always assisted him in time of need; and that for this their good service he was resolved never to abandon them, as they, on their parts, had promised him to hazard life and estate in his defense: that he hoped that God, who

is the reliever of those who are oppressed, would assist them against this great multitude of ill-advised men, who, under the pretence of meriting heaven, had quitted their own habitations to come and burn, pillage, ravage, and murder, in the habitations of others, without either reason, judgment, or mercy.

The King of Arragon returned with this remonstrance to the Legate, who assembled a great number of Lords and Prelates to hear what he had to say, who declared to them, that he had found the Earl of Beziers, his ally, extremely scandalized at their inhuman proceedings against his subjects of Beziers and of the village of Carcasson; and that he was fully persuaded, seeing they had neither spared the Roman Catholics, nor the Priests themselves, that it was not a religious war, as was pretended, but a kind of robbery under the color of religion: that he hoped God would be so favorable to him, as to make his innocence, and the just occasion he hath had to defend himself, sufficiently known: that they must not hope now to have them surrender at discretion, since they had found that there was no other to be expected from them, but that of killing all they met with: that it had never been found good policy to drive an enemy to despair: wherefore if the Legate would be pleased to afford any tolerable composition to the Earl of Beziers and his subjects, that mildness would be a better method to reduce the Albigenses to the Church of Rome, than extreme severity: and that he ought also to remember that the Earl of Beziers was a young man, and a Roman Catholic, who might be very serviceable in reducing his subjects, who had so great confidence in him, to their obedience to the Church.

The Legate told the King of Arragon, that if he would withdraw a little, they would advise what were best to be done. The King being called in again, the Legate told him, that in consideration of his intercession, he would receive the Earl of Beziers to mercy; and therefore, if it seemed good to him, he might come forth, and eleven with him, with his goods and baggage: but that as for the people that were in the city of Carcasson, they should only deliver to his discretion, of which they ought to have a very good opinion, he being the Pope's Legate; and that accordingly they should come forth all stark naked, men, women, and children, without shirts or any other covering on their bodies. Also that the Earl of Beziers should be delivered into sure hands, and that all his estate should be surrendered up to the future lord of his territories, who should be chosen for conservation of the same.

The King of Arragon having endeavored to bring the Legate to easier terms for the young Earl, the Legate told him, that these conditions were very favourable: and yet what follows is still more infamous. The Legate employs a person of quality to endeavor to draw the Earl of Beziers out of Carcasson, and to bring him to him, with assurance under oath, that he would send him back to his city of Carcasson, in case he should not be satisfied with the Legates proposals. The Count of Beziers, upon this assurance, comes to the Legate, and represents to him, that if he would think fit to treat his subjects with more kindness, he would easily induce them to comply with his desire, and recall the Albigenses from their error to the Church: that the terms which had been mentioned to him were shamefull and undecent, for those who were to keep their eyes chaste, as well as their thoughts: that he knew his people would rather die, than see themselves reduced to so scandalous an ignominy, and therefore entreated him to come to easier terms: and that he did not question but to make his subjects accept of any other more tolerable conditions.

The Legate's answer was, that the people of Carcasson might consider what they had to do; that he would concern himself no further, since the Earl was his prisoner, and should continue so till the city were taken, and his subjects acknowledge their duty.

When Simon, Earl of Montfort, was made general or the Church, he was so careful to destroy the Albigenses, that he seized upon all the places belonging to Popish lords, that lay convenient for him, so that the King of Arragon was forced to complain to the Pope of these his proceedings, in some letters yet extant, to oblige him to make restitution. And for the merciful temper of this renowned Earl, take but this one instance of it. After a siege of six months the city of Lavaur was taken by storm and scaling of the walls, and all that were found in it were put to the sword, except fourscore gentlemen whom the Earl caused to be hanged and strangled, and Almericus was hanged on a gallows higher than the rest. The lady of Lavaur was cast alive into a pit, and there stoned to death.

The conduct of the Pope and the Lateran Council, in the year 1215, is worth taking notice of, because it was nothing but a confirmation of all these proceedings. Mezeray gives this account of it. Prince Lewis took upon him the badge of the cross to go against the Albigenses, and assisted in the expedition of

Languedoc; the Earl of Montfort met him at Vienne, and the Legate at Valence. When he was come to St. Gilles, Montfort, who accompanied him, received bulls from the Pope, who, pursuant to the decree of the Council of Montpellier held some months before, had given him the whole territory of Toulouse, and all the rest he had conquered with his crossed pilgrims, provided he could get investiture from the King, and would pay him the accustomed homage: so that we may say, that the Pope nominated him to his dignity, and the King, in compliance with the said nomination, conferred it upon him. From thence Lewis went to Montpellier, and then to Beziers, where he gave order for the demolishing of the walls of Narbon and Toulouse. In the mean time the Council of Lateran, notwithstanding the pitiful remonstrances of the Earl of Toulouse, who was present there in person with his son, adjudged the propriety of his lands to Montfort, reserving only the lands he had in Provence for his son, and four hundred marks of silver a year for his own subsistence, and that too upon condition of his being obedient to the Church. After this, Montfort assumed the title of Earl of Toulouse, and came and received his investiture from the King in the city of Melun. I should never have done, should I barely mention all the cruelties and barbarities which the Romish party exercised for near twenty years together by their continual croisades, against a people who were taken to be heretics, as soon as they found a New Testament in the vulgar tongue about them.

I shall conclude this chapter with setting down the laws which the King of France enacted in the year 1228, against the Albigenses.

"Wherefore because the heretics have now of a long time spread their poison in your parts, polluting our mother the Church after several manners; we do in order to their utter extirpation decree, that all heretics deviating from the Catholic faith, by what name soever they are called, as soon as they are condemned of heresy by the Bishop of the place, or by any other ecclesiastical person that hath power to do it, be without delay punished; ordaining also, and firmly enacting, that no man do presume to harbour or protect the said heretics, or favor or trust them; and that if any one do presume to commit any thing contrary to these premises, he be made incapable of being a witness, or of any honor whatsoever, as also of making a will, or inheriting any thing. Moreover, we enact, that all his goods, real or personal, be, ipso facto, confiscated, never to return to him or any of his posterity. We also enact and command, that all barons of the land, and our bailiffs, and other our subjects present and future, be careful and diligent to purge the land of heretics and heretical contagion, commanding them to be very industrious in searching them out, and faithful in discovering them, and as soon as they have found any of them, to present them without delay before the persons above named, that so being convict in their presence of error and heresy, they may, setting aside all hatred, entreaties, rewards, fear, favor, and love, give sentence against them. And that those who are diligent and careful in the searching for and seizing of heretics, may not want the encouragement of honor and reward; we do enact, will, and command, that our bailiffs, in whose bailiwicks the said heretics shall be seized, pay to the taker for every heretic, two marks in silver, for the term of two years, and after that time expired, one mark only."

Hitherto we have taken a view of what was charged upon the magistrates and lords, to whom the execution of these laws was committed. Let us now consider what other means the Church of Rome made use of; which was, the erecting the tribunal of the Inquisition, the maxims and conduct whereof Pope Gregory XIII. thought good to make known to the world by publishing the Directory for Inquisitors. This tribunal, erected by the Popes for the extirpation of the Albigenses, is a thing in itself so very horrid, that it strikes the Papists themselves with horror, that are not used to it; and yet such as it is, it hath justly been esteemed, and is still to this day thought to be the right hand of the Church of Rome. One may see from some of the published registers of these Inquisitors, and by some of their trials of the Albigenses, the horrid impostures of these Inquisitors, and the terrible punishments they have inflicted upon the Albigenses in all places, where from age to age they have been able to discover them.

CHAPTER 22

That the doctrine of the Albigenses spread itself in England, and continued there till the time of the Reformation.

Henry Knighton tells us, that the Albigensian heretics came over into England in the reign of King John, and that some of them were burnt alive. But yet **we must not think that their doctrine by this means was wholly extinguished; for we find the same appearing again in the persons of the Lollards and Wicklefites. I distinguish the Lollards from the Wicklefites, as being more ancient than they, having appeared in Flanders and Germany from the beginning of the 14th century**, as appears from the testimonies of Johannes Hoesemius and of the Abbot Trithemius; though the same name was afterwards given to the Wicklefites, as is evident from the writings of Walsingham and William Thorn. They seem to have come from the Waldenses and Albigenses, by what Kilianus tells us; *Lollardus quoque dicitur hereticus Waldensis*: "A Lollard is also called a Waldensian heretic."

I need only therefore speak of **their numbers, which, as Knighton assures us, covered all England**: but since they have been charged with most horrid crimes, because they spoke against the images of the saints, and the rest of the Romish superstitions, as well as the vices of the clergy; it will be absolutely necessary to clear them from these false imputations, in the most authentic manner that may be.

Let us therefore examine the calumnies charged upon them by Trithemius, in his *Chronicle of Hirsauge*, on the year 1316, as they were copied by Natalis Alexander, a jacobite Friar, in his *Ecclesiastical History*. The heads of the heresies which Trithemius reckons up are these:

"I. That masses were vain things, to which neither any reverence was due, nor were they of any use or profit."

"II. That Lucifer, with his devils, being unjustly driven out of heaven, should be restored to bliss again; and that Michael, with all the angels, should be sentenced to everlasting punishment; and that all those that were not of their sect should be damned after the same manner."

"III. That the blessed Virgin Mary, if she continued a virgin after her delivery, must have brought forth not a man but an angel."

"IV. They boasted themselves to have twelve Apostles, who every year visited the whole empire; and that two of these being elders in order and profession, did every year enter paradise, and there receive from Enoch and Elias the power of binding and loosing, which they afterwards communicated to the other professors of their sect."

"V. They derided the sacrament of Baptism; saying, if baptism be a sacrament, then every bath is a sacrament, and by consequence every keeper of a bath must be God."

"VI. They shamefully abused the sacrament of Penance, by confessing their sins not to Priests but laymen, and expressing them only in general, and not in particular, and yet they hoped by this their confession, to obtain full and perfect forgiveness both of guilt and punishment."

"VII. The sacrament of the Lord's body they did not believe at all, calling the consecrated Host, a God made with hands."

"VIII. They called the sacrament of Matrimony that was sworn to, fornication."

"IX. They derided the sacrament of Extreme Unction; and being examined what they thought of it, they unanimously answered, We believe that herbs, the more they are laid in oil, the better they are: and they vilified all the consecrations and blessings used in the Church, as so many vain and useless ceremonies."

"X. They blasphemously asserted, that God neither knew nor punished any sins that were committed under the earth, for which reason they used to meet in caves and places under ground, where fathers committed filthiness promiscuously with their daughters, and brothers with their sisters."

"XI. That the Church of Rome was not the Church of Christ, but of infidel heathens; and they despised all ecclesiastical laws, together with all the Bishops and Ministers of the Church."

"XII. Fasts they mocked at, eating flesh at all times, Good-Friday not excepted."

"XIII. They kept no holydays, but wrought even upon Easter-day."

"XIV. They denied that perjury was a sin."

"XV. They denied that the merits or intercessions of the saints could prevail with God for the pardon of men's sins.

And he says, that beside these they professed many other errors, which he omits, for fear of being tedious to his readers.

He adds also, that this heresy did so far prevail, that in Austria, Bohemia, and the neighboring provinces, there were above fourscore thousand men who were sworn to the profession of this sect. From these dregs of heresy, saith he, **Bohemia being then infected, continues tainted with the same to this day.** He subjoins, that many of these heretics were at the same time burnt in divers places of Austria, who all of them continued obstinately in their heresy, with great cheerfulness, until death. Walter, a chief man of that sect, was burnt at Collen in the year 1323, as Trithemius tell us in his *Chronicle* of the monastery of Hirsaugen, in the diocese of Spire."

Nothing can be imagined more horrid than these calumnies, and we need not doubt but they were supported by many pretended convictions made by the Inquisitors of Germany: but **it is easy to demonstrate, that there is scarce any ground for all these accusations, which therefore is a plain proof of what I have elsewhere maintained concerning these persecuted persons, who used it for a proverb in England, *He lies like a Monk*.**

We have an authentic piece of the Lollards, which Roger Dimmock, a jacobite Friar, hath confuted in a manuscript, whereof there are two copies at Cambridge, the one in the public library, and another, older than that, in Trinity college. They presented this confession of theirs to the Parliament, which gave occasion to this Monk to insert it in English, together with his Latin translation, into a book which he dedicated to King Richard II. I need only set down the original, with the Latin translation of Roger Dimmock, which will be sufficient to confound all the calumnies of the Inquisitors.

The Petition of the Lollards [translated from Latin]

We pore men tresorers of Christ and his Apostels, denouncyn to the Lordes and Commens of the Parliament, certeyn conclusions and treuthes for the reformation of holi Church of Ingland, the which hath ben blend and leprouse many yere, be the mayntenance of the proud prelaci, born up with flateryng of privat religion. The which is multiplied to a grete charge, and onerous to pepil here in Ingland.

Whan the Chirch of Ingland began to dote in temperalte after hir step-moder the grete Chirche of Rome, and the Chirches were slayn be appropriacion to divers places: feythe, hope, and charite, begon for to fle out of our Chirch, for pride wit his sori genealogy of dedely sinnes chalangith it, be title of heritage. This conclusion is generale, and is proved by experience, custum, and manner, as you shall heryn after.

The second conclusion is this: our usuel priesthode, the which began in Rome, feyned of a power heyer than angels, is not the priesthode, the which Christ ordeyned to his Apostells. This conclusion is proved; for the priesthode of Rome is marked with signes, rites, and Bishopes blessyngs, and that is of litel vertu, no whet ensamplede in holi Scripture. For the Bishopes ordinals in the New Testament ben litel of record, and we can not se that the Holi Gost for any such signes gifbs any gifts: for he and his holy giftes mai not stond with dedely synne in no manner person.

The correlary of this conclusion, that it is full unketh to many that be wise, to se Bishopes play with the Holi Gost in makynge of her orders, for thei gif crownes in carecters in stede of whit hertes, and that is the livery of Antichrist brought into holi Church to colour idleness.

The thrid conclusion sorowful to here, is that the law of continence enexed to priest-hode, that in prejudice of wymmen was first ordeget, inducyth sodomy in all holi Chirch: bot we excuse us be the Bible, for the suspete decre that saith, that we shall not it. Reson and experience provyth this conclusion, for delicious metis and drynkes of men of holi Chirch, will haf nedful purgation of kind or wers. Experience for the privy asay of such men is, that thai lik no wymmen, and whan thow provest such a man, mark him wele, for he is on of tho. The correlary of this conclusion, that the privat religions begynners of this synne, were most worthi to ben annulled: but God of hys might of prive synnes send open vengeance.

The ferth conclusion, that most harmeth the innocent pepel is this, that the feyned miracle of the sacrament of bred inducyth al men but a few, to idolatre; for thai wen that Goddis bodi that never schal out of heven, bevirtu of Priestis wordes be closed essentiali in a litel bred, that thai shew to the people: but would God they would believe what the Doctor evangelicus seis in his Trialoge, quod panis altaris est habitualiter corpus Christi. For we suppose that on this wise, mai every trew man and womman in Goddes law, mak the sacrament of this brede without any such miracle. The correlary of this conclusion is, that if Christes bodi be dowid with everlasting joi, the servys of corpus Christi, made be Frere Thomas, is untrew, and peynted ful of fals miracles; and that is no wonder, for Frere Thomas that same tyme holdyng with the Pope, wold haf mad a miracle of an hen egge: and we know well, that every lesyng openly preached, turneth him to vilany that ever was trew, and without default.

The fift conclusion is this, that exorsyms and holowyng mad in the Chirch of wine, brede, and way-water, salt, oyle, and encense, the stone of the altar, upon vestment, myter, croys, and pilgrim staves, be the veray practis of nygromancy, rather than of the holi theologi.

This conclusion is proved thus; for be such exorsymes creatures be charget to be of heyer vertu then her own kynd, and we see nothing of chaunge in no such videmus in hujusmodi creaturis exorcizatis vel consecratis nisi per falsam fidem, quae est principale in omni arte diabolica. creature, that is so charmed but be fals beleve, the which is the principal of the develes craft.

The correlary of this, that if the boke that charmeth hali water sprede were al trewe, us thenk verely, that holi water used in hali Chirch, schuld be the best medecyn to all manner of seknes.

The syxt conclusion that maynteneth mychel pride is, that a Kyng and a Bisshop al in on person, a Prelate and a Justice in temperal cause, a Curate and an Officer maken any roem out of gode rewle. This conclusion is oponly schewed, for temperalte and spiritualte be two partis of an holi Chirch, and therefore he that hath taken hym to that one schuld not mell him with that other, quia nemo potest, duobus Dominis servire; and us think that Hermifodrita or Ambidexter were a gode name to such manner of men of dowble estate.

The correlary is, that we the procuratours of God in this cause, do prosu to this Parlement, that al manner of Curates, both hey and low, ben fully excused of temperel office, and occupy hem with her cure and not elles.

The sevent conclusion that we myghtily afferm is, that special praiers for dede mens soules mad in owre Chirch, preferring on be name more than another, this is the fals ground of almes dede, on the which al almes houses of Ingland ben wikkidly grounded. This conclusion is proved by two skilles, on is, for praiser meritory and of valew schold be a werk procedyng of hey and perfit charite, accept no persones, quia diliges

proximum, etc. Wherefore us thenkes that the gift of temporel godes to Priestes and to almes-houses, is principal cause of special praier, the which is no fer fro symony. Another skil for special praier, mad for men dampned to everlastand payne, is to God gretly displesant, and thow it be dowe, it is likli to trewe Christes peple, that the fownders of almes-houses, for her venymous dotation ben for the most part passed the brode well. The correlary is, the prayer of value springand out of perfect charite schold embrace in general, al tho that God wold hal saved, and leve merchaundys now usyd for spiritual prayers, ymade to mendicaunts, possessioners, and other soul Priestes, the which ben a pepel of grete charge to al the reme mayntenyd in idlenes; for it was proved in a boke, that the Kyng hard that a hundreth of almes-hous suffised to all the reme, and there schold fal the grettest encrease possibil to temporel parti.

The eight conclusion nedful to tell to the pepel begiled, is the pilgrinage, prayers, and offering made to blind rodes, and to defe ymages of tre and of ston, that be ner of kyn to ydolatri, and fer fro almes dede. And thow this forbidden ymageri, be a boke of error to the lewde pepul, yit the ymage usuel of the Trinitie, is most abhominable. This conclusion God openly schews, commandyng to do almes-dede to men that be nedy, for thai be the ymage of God in a mor liknes than the stok or stone: for God sais not, *Faciamus lignum ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*, bot *Faciamus hominem*, etc. for the hey worchip that Clerkes clepen latria, longes to the godhede alone; and the low worchip that they clepen dulia, perteneth to man and to angels, and to lower creatures.

The correlary is, that the service of the rode tre donn twyes every yer in our Chirch, is ful filled of ydolatrie; for if the rode-tre, nail, sper, and the crowne of God schoul be so heyle worchiped, than were Judas lippes, who so myght ham gete a wonder gret relick. Bot we pray the pilgrine us to tell, what thow offers to seintes schryned in any place, wheder releves you the seint that is in blis, or the pore almes-hous that is so well endowed for men canonized God wot how. And to speke more in plain, trew Christen men supposen, that the point of that noble man, that men clepen Seint Thomas, were no cause of martirdome.

The nint conclusion that holdes the pepel low is, that the articles of confession that is said necessari to salvacion of man, with a feyned power of absolucion, enhaunceth priestes pride, and gyf hem oportunitie of prive calling, other than we will now say. For lordes and ladys ben arrested that for fete of here confessours they dur not seyn a trewth. And in tyme of confession is the best tyme of wowing, and of prive continuance of dedely synne. Thai seyn thai ben commissaries of God to deme of every synne, to foulen and to clense whom so thai like. Thei sai that thai have the keyes of heaven and of hell, they may curse and bless, bynd and unbynd, at her own will; insomuch that for a busschel of whete or twelve pence be yer, thei will sell the bliss of heaven be chartir, of clause, of warrantise en sele with the commun sele. This conclusion is so seen in use that it nedtyh no other prof.

Correlarium, the Pope of Rome that feynet him hey tresorer of holi Chirch, havand the worthi jewel of Christes passion in hys keyping with the desertes of al hollowen of heaven, by which he geveth the feyned pardon, a poena et a culpa, he is a tresorer most banyst out of charite seyn he may deliver the prisoners that ben in payn at his own will, and mak himself so that he schall never com there: her may every trew Christen man wel se that ther mich prive falshede hid in our Chirche.

The tent conclusion is, that manslout be batail or onn law of rigtwisenes, for temporel cause or spirituel, without special revelacion, is expresse contrarious to the New Testament, the which is a law of grece, and full of mercy. This conclusion is oponly proved be ensample of Christes preching here in erthe, the wyche most taugte for to lowe and have mercy of his enemys, and nogt for to sle hem. The reason is of this, that for the more party ther men figt affter the first stroke charite is ybroke, and who so deyth out of charite goth the hey way to hell. And over this, we know wele that no Clerk can fynde be Scripture or be reason, lawful punischment of deth, for on dedely synne and not for another. Bot the law of mercy, that is, the New Testament, forbede al manslaughte in Evangelio, dictum est antiquis, Non occides.

The correlary is, it is holi robbing of the pore pepil whan lordes purchas indulgence a poena et a culpa to hem, that helpeth to his ost to al the Christen men in ferre londes for temporel goode as we haf seen, and knyghtes that renne to heyennes to geten hem a name, in sleying of men get mych maugre of the Kyng of pees; for be meknes and sufferance, our beleve was multiplied, and figters and mansleyrs, hem Christ hateth and manasseth, Qui gladio percutit gladio peribit.

The eleventh conclusion ys scham for to say, that the avowe of continence made in our Chirch of wymmen, the wych ben febil and unperfite in kynd, is cause of brynging of most horribel synne possible to mankynd; for thow sleying of childeren or thei ben christened, abortyfe, or stroying of kind be medicine ben ful synful: yit knowing hem self, or unreasonable best, or creature that bereth no, passyd in worthiness to ben punished in paynes of hell.

The correlary is, that wydewes, and such as han taken the mantel and the ryng, deliciouslych fed, we wold thei were wedded, for we ne can excuse hem of pryvy synnes.

The twelfth conclusion is, that the multitude of craftes noght nedful used in our Chirche norisch mykel synne in wast curiosity and disgysing. This schewes experience, and reason proveth, for nature with a few craftes sufficed to nede of man.

The correlary is, that sais Seint Poule, we havand our bodily fode, and cleying we schuld hold us payed. Us think that goldsmythes and armorers, and al manner craftes, not nedful to man afer the Apostel, schuld be destroyed, for the encreas of vertu. For thow this twey craftes nemed wer mych more nedful in the old law, the New Testament has voyded these and many other.

[Note from the publisher of this electronic edition of Allix's work: The following modernization of the previous old English translation is offered to assist contemporary readers in understanding what the old Lollards were asking of the British Parliament. There are still many difficult passages that need further work, and I intend to go back over this at a later date and perfect it:

We poor men treasurers of Christ and Apostles, denounce to the Lords and Commons of the Parliament, certain conclusions and truths for the reformation of holy Church of England, the which hath been bleeding and leprous many years, by the maintenance of the proud prelacy, born up with flattering of private religion. The which is multiplied to a great charge, and onerous to people here in England.

When the Church of England began to dote in temporality after her step-mother the great Church of Rome, and the Churches were slain by appropriation to divers places: faith, hope, and charity began for to flee out of our Church, for pride with his sorry genealogy of deadly sins challengeth it, by title of heritage. This conclusion is general, and is proved by experience, custom, and manner, as you shall hear after.

The second conclusion is this: our usual priesthood, the which began in Rome, feigned of a power higher than angels, is not the priesthood, the which Christ ordered to his Apostles. This conclusion is proved; for the priesthood of Rome is marked with signs, rites, and Bishop's blessings, and that is of little virtue, with no ensample in holy Scripture. For the Bishops ordinals in the New Testament are little of record, and we can not see that the Holy Ghost for any such signs gives any gifts: for he and his holy gifts may not stand with deadly sin in no manner of person.

The corollary of this conclusion, that it is full unketh to many that be wise, to see Bishops play with the Holy Ghost in making of her orders, for they give crowns in characters instead of white hearts, and that is the livery of Antichrist brought into holy Church to colour idleness.

The third conclusion sorrowful to here, is that the law of continence annexed to priesthood, that in prejudice of women was first ordained, induceth sodomy in all holy Church: but we excuse us by the Bible, for the suspect decree that saith, that we shall not it. Reason and experience proveth this conclusion, for delicious meats and drinks of men of holy Church, will have needful purgation of kind or wers. Experience for the privy assay of such men is, that they like no women, and when thou provest such a man, mark him well, for he is one of those.

The corollary of this conclusion, that the private religions beginners of this sin, were most worthy to be annulled: but God of his might of private sins send open vengeance.

The fourth conclusion, that most harmeth the innocent people is this, that the feigned miracle of the sacrament of bread induceth all men but a few, to idolaters; for they say that God's body that never shall out of heaven, by virtue of Priest's words be closed essentially in a little bread, that they shew to the people: but would God they would believe what the Doctor evangelicus says in his Trialoge, *quod panis altaris est habitualiter corpus Christi*. For we suppose that on this wise, may every true man and woman in God's law, make the sacrament of this bread without any such miracle.

The corollary of this conclusion is, that if Christ's body be endowed with everlasting joy, the service of corpus Christi, made by Friar Thomas, is untrue, and painted full of false miracles; and that is no wonder, for Friar Thomas that same time holding with the Pope, would have made a miracle of an hen egg: and we know well, that every leasing openly preached, turneth him to villainy that ever was true, and without default.

The fifth conclusion is this, that exorcisms and hollowing made in the Church of wine, bread, and way-water, salt, oil, and incense, the stone of the altar, upon vestment, miter, crois, and pilgrim staves, be the very practice of necromancy, rather than of the holy theology. This conclusion is proved thus; for by such exorcises creatures be charged to be of higher virtue then her own kind, and we see nothing of change in no such creature, that is so charmed but be false belief, the which is the principal of the devil's craft.

The corollary of this, that if the book that charmeth holy water spread were all true, us think verily, that holy water used in holy Church, should be the best medicine to all manner of sickness.

The sixth conclusion that maintaineth much pride is, that a King and a Bishop all in on person, a Prelate and a Justice in temporal cause, a Curate and an Officer make any room out of good rule. This conclusion is openly shewn, for temporality and spirituality be two parts of an holy Church, and therefore he that hath taken him to that one should not meld him with that other, *quia nemo potest, duobus Dominis servire*; and us think that Hermifodrita or Ambidexter were a good name to such manner of men of double estate.

The corollary is, that we the procurators of God in this cause, do prosu to this Parliament, that all manner of Curates, both high and low, be fully excused of temporal office, and occupy him with her cure and not ails.

The seventh conclusion that we mightily affirm is, that special prayers for dead men's souls made in our Church, preferring on by name more than another, this is the false ground of alms deed, on the which all alms houses of England be wickedly grounded. This conclusion is proved by two skilles, on is, for prayer meritory and of value should be a work proceeding of high and perfect charity, accept no persons, *quia diliges proximum*, etc. Wherefore us thinks that the gift of temporal goods to Priests and to alms-houses, is principal cause of special prayer, the which is not far from simony. Another skil for special prayer, made for men damned to everlasting pain, is to God greatly displeasing, and though it be doubt, it is likely to true Christian people, that the founders of alms-houses, for her venomous dotation be for the most part passed the brode well.

The corollary is, the prayer of value springing out of perfect charity should embrace in general, all those that God would have saved, and leave merchandise now used for spiritual prayers, made to mendicants, possessioners, and other soul Priests, the which be a people of great charge to all the realm maintained in idleness; for it was proved in a book, that the King heard that a hundredth of alms-house sufficed to all the realm, and there should fall the greatest increase possible to temporal part.

The eight conclusion needful to tell to the people beguiled, is the pilgrimage, prayers, and offering made to blind roods, and to deaf images of tree and of stone, that be near of kin to idolatry, and far from alms deed. And through this forbidden imagery, by a book of error to the lewd people, yet the image used of the Trinity, is most abominable. This conclusion God openly shows, commanding to do alms-deed to men that be needy, for they be the image of God in a more likness than the stock or stone: for God says not, *Faciamus lignum ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram*, but *Faciamus hominem*, etc. for the high worship that Clerkes call *latria*, belongs to the godhead alone; and the low worship that they call *dulia*, pertaineth to man and to angels, and to lower creatures.

The corollary is, that the service of the rood tree done twice every year in our Church, is full filled of idolatry; for if the rood-tree, nail, spear, and the crown of God should be so high worshiped, than were Judas lips, who so might have gotten a wonder great relic. But we pray the pilgrim us to tell, what through offers to saints shrined in any place, whether relieves you the saint that is in bliss, or the poor alms-house that is so well endowed for men canonized God know how. And to speak more in plain, true Christen men suppose, that the point of that noble man, that men called Saint Thomas, were no cause of martyrdom.

The ninth conclusion that holds the people low is, that the articles of confession that is said necessary to salvation of man, with a feigned power of absolution, enhanceth priest's pride, and give him opportunity of private calling, other than we will now say. For lords and ladies are arrested that for fear of the confessors they dare not say a truth. And in time of confession is the best time of wowing, and of private continuance of deadly sin. They say that they be commissaries of God to deem of every sin, to foulen and to cleanse whom so they like. They say that they have the keys of heaven and of hell, they may curse and bless, bind and unbind, at her own will; insomuch that for a bushel of wheat or twelve pence a year, they will sell the bliss of heaven by charter, of clause, of warranties and sell with the common sale. This conclusion is so seen in use that it needeth no other proof.

Correlarium, the Pope of Rome that feigns him high treasurer of holy Church, has the worthy jewel of Christ's passion in his keeping with the deserts of all hallowed of heaven, by which he giveth the feigned pardon, a *poena et a culpa*, he is a treasurer most banyst out of charity saying he may deliver the prisoners that are in pain at his own will, and make himself so that he shall never come there: here may every true Christen man well see that there much private falsehood hid in our Church.

The tenth conclusion is, that manslaughter, by bataille or onn law of righteousness, for temporal cause or spiritual, without special revelation, is expressly contrary to the New Testament, the which is a law of grace, and full of mercy. This conclusion is openly proved be ensample of Christ's preaching here in earth, the which most taught for to love and have mercy of his enemies, and not for to slay him. The reason is of this, that for the more party ther men fight after the first stroke charity is broken, and who so dieth out of charity goeth the high way to hell. And over this, we know well that no Clerk can find by Scripture or by reason, lawful punishment of death, for one deadly sin and not for another. Bot the law of mercy, that is, the New Testament, *forbede al manslaughter in Evangelio, dictum est antiquis, Non occides*.

The corollary is, it is holy robbing of the poor people when lord purchase indulgence a *poena et a culpa* to him, that helpeth to his ost to all the Christen men in fear londes for temporal good as we have seen, and knights that renne to heavens to get him a name, in slaying of men get much maugre of the King of peace; for by meekness and sufferance, our belief was multiplied, and fighters and manslayers, him Christ hateth and manaseth, *Qui gladio percutit gladio peribit*.

The eleventh conclusion is shame for to say, that the vow of continence made in our Church of women, the which be feeble and unperfect in kind, is cause of bringing of most horrible sin possible to mankind; for through slaying of children or they by christened, aborted, or destroying of kind by medicine be full sinful: yet knowing him self, or unreasonable best, or creature that beareth no, passed in worthiness to be punished in pains of hell.

The corollary is, that widows, and such as have taken the mantel and the ring, deliciously fed, we would they were wedded, for we never can excuse him of private sins.

The twelfth conclusion is, that the multitude of crafts not needful used in our Church nourish much sin in waste curiosity and disguising. This shows experience, and reason proveth, for nature with a few crafts sufficed to need of man.

The corollary is, that says Saint Paul, we have our bodily food, and clothing we should hold us paid. Us think that goldsmiths and armorers, and all manner crafts, not needful to man after the Apostle, should be destroyed, for the increase of virtue. For though these crafts named were much more needful in the old law, the New Testament has voided these and many other.]

I suppose it is not necessary, after the perusal of this piece, to observe, that the Romish Clergy cast those crimes upon the Lollards, whereof themselves were guilty, and which the Lollards laid to their charge in the face of heaven and earth.

It will be said, perhaps, that this petition contains several errors; I own it: but we are to observe, first, that it is part of the frailty of mankind, to fall into the contrary extreme, whilst we endeavor to avoid those things that appear to us to be mortal. Secondly, that these failings may be easily extenuated by the same charity which we commonly make use of, when we speak of the ancientest fathers of the Church.

But this, will some object, respects only the Lollards of England, and cannot be extended to the justifying of the Lollards of Germany, who might have been guilty of the crimes whereof they are accused. To this objection I answer, first, that since the Lollards, according to the testimony of Kilianus, reported by M. du Cange, were the same with the Waldenses; the Bishop of Meaux hath already drawn up their apology, by maintaining, that they differed only in a very few things from the Papists.

Secondly, that if one should reject the Bishop's opinion, yet sufficient matter for their justification may be found in the writings of the more honest authors of the Romish communion, such as AEneas Sylvius and some others, without speaking of their own writings or apologies, whereof we have some few remnants printed.

Be it as it will, to return to our English Lollards; Fox, in his Acts and Monuments, gives us a bull of Pope Boniface IX. directed to John, Bishop of Hereford, to oblige him to put King Richard II. upon persecuting of them. As likewise the bull sent to King Richard on the same subject, which imports, that he had commanded the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to prosecute them with the utmost rigour and severity; and afterwards sets down the commission of Richard II. for the trial of one Walter Brute, one of that party.

He hath also given us the history of the manner of their being hanged and burnt by the King's order in 1414. But because it will be of moment to acquaint the public in what points they chiefly differed from the Church of Rome; and because there is come into my hands a register of some of the ancient Bishops of Salisbury, wherein are contained many trials of these ancient Christians, I thought it necessary to add some of those trials at the end of this book, faithfully copied from the original. There is no doubt but that there are many of them in the registers of Canterbury, of York, and of several other sees, which could demonstrate, that the Romish Clergy have never, till the very Reformation, omitted their utmost endeavors towards the extirpation, by fire and fagot, of all those that rebuked them for their vices, and for the corruption of their doctrine.

CHAPTER 23

Of the doctrine of Wicklef and his disciples in England.

But whether the Lollards maintained the doctrine of the Albigenses in England or no, certain it is, that it received new lustre from the learning of Wicklef, and those who joined with him in the defense of the truth, against the Friars and Court of Rome. My design is not to examine the whole history of Wicklef and of his disciples to the bottom: the Bishop of Meaux hath done his endeavours to blacken them, and to load them with the foulest calumnies: I only say in short, that the Bishop did not take the pains to consult what Mr. Wood hath writ on this subject, in his *History of the University of Oxford*; where he cites the registers of the University, which refute the greatest part of those slanders that the Romish party have published against Wicklef.

However, thus much is evident, that John Wicklef was the most renowned man of that age, both for learning and piety. He had been educated at the University of Oxford, where scholastical divinity had established its empire, by the care of Robert Grosthead, John Duns, Occam, Richard of Armagh, and divers others. He there publicly professed divinity, and was at last made Rector of Lutterworth in Leicestershire, where he died peaceably, after great and long troubles, which he suffered for the defense of the truth.

The Pope had at this time usurped almost the whole royal authority, and more especially in England, where, after King John had made himself a vassal of the Church of Rome, under Innocent III. the Popes commanded the Kings of England at pleasure. We see by the writings of Herveus Brito, who wrote at Paris about the beginning of this century, where he was Professor, that the temporal power over all the world was directly attributed to the Pope, neither did any kings oppose themselves against it. It is well known that the canonists, who had then the reputation, had no other song in their mouths but that of the Pope's divinity, his succession to the rights of Jesus Christ, and consequently his absolute empire over all the world. This we meet with in all their writings, and more especially in those who writ in defense of the Popes, against the Emperor Lewis of Bavaria.

The Friars Mendicants, whom Cardinal Albizi did very truly call the Pope's soldiers, had usurped all the rights of the secular Clergy, and advanced their conquests for the Pope to that degree, that the authority of the Princes and Bishops signified nothing any longer in England, except only when they acted in favor of the Monks. From the time of Matthew Paris, who gives us so strange a description of their insolence, and of their attempts against the authority of the Clergy, things were carried to that height, that nothing was any longer able to oppose them.

Without doubt there was great need of courage, as great as Wicklef's was, and learning too as vast as his, to stop so impetuous a torrent. This great man set himself against it, and carried on his design after such a manner, that the effects and consequences of it continued to the very Reformation. It would take up a volume to give a particular account of what he wrote in the reigns of Edward III. and Richard II. I shall content myself to take notice only of some few particulars, and I shall afterwards treat of his doctrine, which diffused itself through Germany, and brought about a great reformation there.

1. He publicly opposed, in his Professor's chair, several errors of the Church of Rome, which the Monks and Popes by their authority endeavored to maintain and countenance; in which undertaking, he was always backed by the body of that University where he had taught so long time.
2. He maintained his doctrine by the favor of the Court, and the most illustrious and learned members thereof, and with so great a satisfaction of the people, that Knighton is obliged to acknowledge, that one half, yea, the greater part of the people owned his doctrine.

3. He had made so great progress amongst the Clergy, that he writes himself, that above a third part of the Clergy were ready to defend his doctrine with the hazard of their lives: accordingly he appeared boldly at the synod of the Archbishop of Canterbury, in February 1377, to give an account of his doctrine; where he defended himself with that vigour, that none durst gainsay him. He appeared there again the same year in May, neither durst the Archbishop, then decide any thing against him. And when in the year 1382, they in his absence condemned some articles which he maintained, yet he was there defended by the deputies of the University of Oxford, who gave a public and authentic testimony of his piety, and his purity in the faith.

4. The University of Oxford had espoused his quarrel with the Church of Rome so far, that after his having been attacked by a council at London, in 1382, and after having maintained his doctrine from the year 1367 with public applause, his writings continued recommended by a decree of the University, to all the students, both in the public schools and colleges, and were not forced from them till after his condemnation, which happened at the Council of Constance, twenty-eight years after his death. We see the esteem Wicklef had in that University, by the testimony they gave in 1406, against those that endeavored to blemish the memory of this great man: for after they had spoken of his piety and probity, as of a thing known to all men, after they had declared that he was a courageous defender of the faith, they add, *qui singulos mendicitate spontanea Christi religionem blasphemantes, sacrae Scripturae sentiis catholice expugnavit*: "that he had in a Catholic way, by texts of Scripture, overthrown all those, who by a voluntary poverty blasphemed the religion of Christ."

And since the Romish party had not at that time a more formidable enemy than Wicklef, they were not wanting to muster all their forces in order to suppress his doctrine. In the year 1396, William Woodeford, a Cordelier, was chosen by Thomas Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury, to write against Wicklef's *Trialogue*, which he did accordingly, refuting eighteen articles of his doctrine. This book is printed in the Fasciculus.

In the year 1411, Thomas Walden, an Englishman, deputed to the Council of Constance, dedicated his Doctrinal to Pope Martin V. against Wicklef, where he accuseth him of above eight hundred errors. This Monk, as able as he was, was really one of the most passionate disputers that ever writ: but withal it is true also, that to follow his measures, we can scarcely imagine a more particular discussion of the errors, superstitions, and false suppositions, which the Church of Rome makes use of to maintain her errors and false worship, than that which Wicklef made use of. In the account that Walden gives of it, we meet with a great knowledge of holy Scripture, and great skill in antiquity, whose authority he makes use of to confound the Romish novelties: we discover there a great strength in his way of reasoning, and an extraordinary method in his consequences; so that he seems to have fully penetrated the weakness of the Romish cause, and overthrown its whole foundations.

One may plainly discover this, by running over the titles of the Doctrinal of Thomas Walden, upon matters of faith, upon the sacraments, upon those which he calls sacramental things, or that belong to sacraments; for we scarcely meet with any articles controverted between the Church of Rome and the Protestants, which Wicklef hath not touched and handled, and that with sufficient exactness too. This hath obliged the Papists with so much care to reprint Walden's works against Wicklef, as containing a body of their controversies against the Protestants.

I am not ignorant that Walden objects some very harsh and impious opinions to him, and that the Council of Constance has mingled several of that nature amongst the forty-five articles of Wicklef, which are there condemned. But here I must desire my reader to call to mind four things: First, that Woodeford hath objected no such thing to Wicklef, which shews that he never taught any like doctrine, but that they are only consequences drawn by a scholastical Divine, who was used to carry things too far. Secondly, that Walden wrote at a time when the Popish party had the upper hand in the Court of Henry V. who had condemned the Wicklefites as guilty of high treason, which Walden takes notice of in his dedication to Martin V. Thirdly, that it is very probable that this catalogue of forty-five articles was drawn up by Walden himself, who was present at the Council of Constance on purpose to promote Wicklef's condemnation. Fourthly, that the Council of Constance was the first, where by public consent that maxim, that faith is not to be kept with heretics, was ever put in practice. Now let any one judge what equity or truth can be expected from villains of such profligate principles, who think it an honor to act in every thing according to them?

After all this I might well excuse myself from setting down the opinions of Wicklef, or from saying any thing for his justification; but I am willing to do both the one and the other, for the honor of this great man, and for the reader's satisfaction. The opinions of Wicklef, with relation to the doctrine of Protestants, are these.

CHAPTER 24

Of the calumnies that have been unjustly charged upon Wicklef by the Papists.

1. Wicklef owns but twenty-two canonical books of Scripture, excluding all the rest, which he calls apocryphal.

2. He teaches that the Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation.

"Forasmuch," saith he, "as in Scripture all truth is contained, it is evident that all disputes that take not their rise thence are profane. We are not to admit any knowledge or conclusion, which hath not its testimony from Scripture."

3. He affirms, that every well-disposed Christian may understand the holy Scripture.

"God hath appointed the common sensible Scripture to the comprehending of the catholic sense, whereof God can never be wanting, because he always enlighteneth some particular men, to which illumination holiness of life conduceth very much, and it is the duty of divines to continue it in our mother the Church, which ought to keep within her bounds; so that it is not lawful for divines to frame strange doctrines, besides the faith of catholic Scripture." For which end he lays down several rules for the understanding of the Scriptures.

4. He asserts that the Scriptures ought to be translated into the vulgar tongue.

"The truth of God," saith he, "is not more confined to one language than to another. Jesus Christ delivered the Lord's Prayer in a known language. Why then may not the Gospel and other parts of Scripture be writ in English? The Clergy ought to rejoice that the people know the law of God."

It was for this reason that he translated the whole Bible, whereof several copies are still to be found in the King's library, and in several other libraries in England.

We may easily know what he thought of tradition from these words: **"We have a perfect knowledge of all things necessary to salvation, from the faith of Scripture. Decrees, statutes, and rites, that are added according to human traditions, are all inseparably sinful, because they make the law of God more difficult to be kept, and hinder the course of God's word. Traditions are hateful to God and the Church, except only so far as they are grounded on Scripture. Men's own inventions are chiefly to get money: they all sound for the Church's gain."**

1. See what he saith of the Pope's authority.

"In Constantine's time the priesthood was removed; and it was not decreed, that the Bishop of that Church should necessarily have a primacy over all others, as is here supposed. Neither do I believe that any Catholic is so foolish as to believe, that when Christ's vicar writes, Let it be done, and he who spake the word and all things were made, doth not approve of it, he hath any right to command, because of him alone it can be said with truth, So I will, and so I command; let my will stand instead of reason."

And accordingly he was condemned by the Council of Constance for believing, that it is ridiculous to suppose the Pope to be the highest Priest; and that Christ never approved of any such dignity, neither in Peter nor in any one else.

2. Of the power which the Popes assume to themselves over the temporalities of kings, Wicklef wrote a particular treatise, entitled, *De Civili Dominio*, to overthrow their claims, where he speaks thus: "In civil power there cannot be two lords of equal authority; the one must be principal, and the other subordinate. We will not subject our King in this matter to him, when he, bestowing any mortmain, reserves to himself the capital dominion."

3. He did not believe the Pope's infallibility.

"The Pope may sin as head of the Church. He may sin by nature, having a capital Lord above him. There is no doubt but that an error may be committed in the election of a Pope, and yet more in his following conversation. He may err in feeding the churches, or in articles of the faith. Many Popes have been corrupted with heretical pravity. He believed it was probable, that all the Bishops of Rome, for three hundred years and more before his time, were fully heretics".

4. He made no difficulty of saying that the Pope was the chiefest Antichrist.

(1) Wicklef informs us what his thoughts were of the Church of Rome, when he saith, "It is possible that the Lord Pope may be ignorant of the law of Scripture, and the Church of England may be far truer in her judgment of catholic truth, than the whole Church of Rome that is made up of the Pope and Cardinals"

(2) He maintains that the Church of Rome may err, but that this doth not hinder, but that the purity of doctrine may be preserved in the catholic Church. "It is necessary," says he, "that the Catholic faith be in the whole mother Church."

(3) He did not believe that wicked men were true members of the Church; and censures those who teach, that men who shall be damned are notwithstanding members of the Church, so joining Christ and the Devil:

"They teachen together," saith he, "that the men that shall be damned be members of holy Church, and thus they wedden Christ and the Devil together:"

He saith, that unbelieving and ungodly men "are in the holy Church by body, not by thought; by name, not by deed; in number, not by merit."

As to the doctrine of justification, it is very plain, that he was not of the opinion of the Church of Rome, as these words shew: "The merit of Christ is of itself sufficient to redeem every man from hell: it is to be understood of a sufficiency of itself, without any other concurring cause. All that follow Christ, being justified by his righteousness, shall be saved as his offspring."

He rejects the doctrine of the merit of works, and falls upon those which say, "that God did not all for them, but think that their merits help. Heal us Lord for nought, that is, no merit of ours, but for thy mercy: Lord, not to us, but to thy mercy give thy joy."

As for what concerns the Lord's Supper, we find that this great man did not believe transubstantiation. See how he expresses himself; "This bread is fairly, truly, and really, spiritually, virtually, and sacramentally, the body of Christ; as St. John the Baptist was figuratively Elias, and not personally. As Christ is both God and man at once, so the consecrated host is the body of Christ and true bread at the same time, because it is the body of Christ at least in a figure, and true bread in its nature; or, which signifies the same thing, it is true bread naturally, and the body of Christ figuratively. He constantly affirmed that this doctrine lasted in the Church for a thousand years, till Sathanas was unbound, and the people blinded by Friars, with the heresy of accidents without subjects."

(1) He owned but two sacraments, as appears by the 45th, 46th, 47th, and 48th articles, condemned at Oxford, and in the Council of Constance.

(2) He was against the use of chrism in Baptism.

(3) He maintained that Extreme Unction was not a sacrament. "If corporal unction were a sacrament, as now is pretended, Christ and his Apostles would not have been wanting to declare it to the world."

(4) His opinion concerning confirmation, as it is practiced amongst the Papists, he expresseth thus: "As for the oil wherewith the Bishops anoint children, and the linen coif that covers the head, it seems to be a vain ceremony, that can have no foundation in Scripture, and that this confirmation, being introduced without any apostolical authority, is blasphemy against God."

1. He declaimed against the use of images with great earnestness. "We ought to preach," saith he, "against the costliness, beautifulness, and other arts of cheating, wherewith we impose upon strangers, rather to pick their pockets, than for the propagation of Christ's religion. The Devil by his falsehood deludes many, who sometimes suppose a miracle to have been wrought, when indeed it was nothing but a cheat. The poison of idolatry lies hid in continued imagination."

2. One may see how he distinguisheth sins: "Some sins are called little sins in comparison of greater, and venial, because God's Son forgives them."

3. He did not own the necessity of auricular confession: "Vocal confession made to the Priest, introduced by Innocent, is not so necessary. If a man be truly contrite, all outward confession is superfluous and unprofitable to him."

4. He wrote against the doctrine of satisfaction: "The present Pope has reason to blush for the modern penance, established by him without any ground, since it is not lawful for any mortals, no, not for the Apostles themselves, to make the law of God difficult beyond what he himself hath limited."

5. His judgment concerning pardons and indulgences he expresseth in these words: "It is a foolish thing to rely upon the indulgences of the Pope and the Bishops."

6. He gives this rule concerning fasting: "In works of humanity we must follow Christ, by doing such works as bear some proportion with his. -- We must fast forty days from sin, and, as far as is possible to nature, from superfluous corporal food."

7. Concerning Monks and their vows, he speaks thus: "Friars studien to be rich: they rob men by begging -- Touch a great cup of gold or silver, but not a penny or farthing. They magnify more obedience to sinful men than to Christ."

8. He approved the marriage of Priests.

9. He disapproved the practice of the Church of Rome in the matter of divorces. "To make divorce common, innumerable subterfuges are invented."

10. He blamed the custom of the Church of Rome, in granting dispensations for marrying in case of propinquity of blood. "Such dispensations as these bring confusion into the Church."

11. He condemned all equivocation, which so many casuists of the Church of Rome pretend to justify.

12. He maintains that the king ought not to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction; "for otherwise," saith he, "kings would not be able fully to keep the peace in their own kingdoms."

13. He blamed the too frequent use of excommunication.

14. He maintained, "that a true Christian ought not to believe implicitly, but with an explicit faith, that expresses the particulars, more or less, according as they are more or less obliged by God and his gifts, and the opportunity of time."

15. He had no great veneration for the doctrine of Purgatory, when he saith, "Whatsoever is said of purgatory is only spoke threateningly, as so many pious lies."

Thus we see what was Wiclef's faith, and what his judgment was concerning the superstitious and corruptions of the Church of Rome; from whence we may gather that he came very near to the belief of the Protestant Churches.

It was no difficult matter therefore for Dr. James to justify him against the horrid calumnies of Walden, by consulting his manuscript works, which are to be found in several libraries in England.

1. They objected against him, that he taught, that if a Priest or a Bishop ordains or consecrates the Sacrament of the Altar, or administers Baptism whilst he is in mortal sin, it can do him no service.

But the falsehood of this objection appears from Wiclef's own words, which assure us of the contrary: "Except a Christian," saith he, "be united to Christ by grace, he hath not Christ the Savior; nor without falsehood can he pronounce the sacramental words, though they may do good to those who are capable of them: for it behoves the Priest that consecrates, to be a member of Christ; and, as some holy men express it, to be in some sort Christ himself."

They objected against him, that he had asserted, that it was not lawful for any ecclesiastical person to have any temporal revenue.

But nothing is more false, for Wiclef only saith, that the goods of the Clergy are temporal things, what way soever they come by them; and that the possession of them is to be regulated by the laws, as well as the estates of laymen; "The goods of spiritual men, saith he, be temporal, in what manner soever they come to them, and must be ordered after the temporal law, as the goods of temporal men must be."

They said that it was his opinion, that no Prelate ought to excommunicate any person whatsoever, unless he knew that God himself had excommunicated him.

But Wiclef only speaks of those rash and precipitate excommunications, which never fail to produce bad effects, and which are only discharged from carnal respects.

"They, like the High Priests, Scribes, and Pharisees, do not only eat the flesh, but the very bones too; they do not water what is dry with the word of God, but endeavor to cut and break what is fat and full of marrow."

He saith also, "that excommunications are the fruit of pride, to terrify poor laymen."

They accused him of teaching, that a man could not be either a Bishop or Priest, as long as he continued in mortal sin.

But no such thing can be inferred from Wiclef's words; for he, still aiming at the reformation of the Clergy, which was very corrupt in his time, did not carry it too far when he said, "that it is not the name that makes a Bishop, but the life. Whosoever has only the name of a Priest or Bishop, and does not endeavor to add to that name the reason of it, he is in truth neither Bishop nor Priest."

They affirmed, that he had taught that sovereigns might deprive the Clergy of their possessions, if they thought good, as often as they committed any fault.

But Wicklef never pretended, that the Clergy ought to be deprived of the goods they possessed for slight faults. True it is, he did not think the government was obliged to maintain so many useless Monks: but as to the Bishops and Priests, he never taught that they ought to be deprived of their benefices, except they made themselves unworthy of them by a perfectly scandalous life.

He taught, say they, that tithes were only alms, and that the parishioners might keep them back, and put them to what other uses they pleased. I own that Wicklef often said, that tithes were nothing else but mere alms; but it is false that ever he asserted, that the parishioners might keep them back: on the contrary, he saith,

"It belongs to parishioners, for the good of their souls, to minister tithes and oblations to whom they are due. The Priests of Christ ought to withdraw the word of God from those who are not rightly disposed for it; that is, if the people should be so obstinate and disobedient to holy mother the Church, as either to forbid or not to minister the necessities of life to him who preaches the Gospel to them."

They object against him, that he despised temporal things too much, for the love which he had for those that are eternal; and that he joined himself to the Mendicant Friars, approving their poverty, and commending their perfection. A strange crime indeed!

It is a surprising thing to see them accuse Wicklef upon this account; but it is no less astonishing to hear them assert, that he had great inclination for the Begging Friars: to be convinced of the falsity whereof, we need only read the complaint he made to the Parliament, and his treatise against the order of Begging Friars.

He held, say they, that Churchmen ought to beg.

Whereas, on the contrary, he maintained, that God had condemned beggary, in the Old and New Testament. See the fifth chapter of his book against the order of Friars Mendic.

They accuse him for condemning lawful oaths.

But this is for want of having read his works; for it appears by his Latin *Exposition of the Third Commandment*, and by his book *Of the Truth of Scripture*, that he condemns all manner of equivocations and ambiguous expressions, whether with oaths or without. He will not have any one to lie for a world, or to save an infinite number of souls, and much less to swear falsely.

He taught, say they, that all things come to pass by an absolute necessity. We may easily see what Wicklef believed concerning this matter. "God promiseth no man either reward or punishment, but under either a tacit or express condition. Though all future things do happen necessarily; yet God wills that good things happen to his servants through the efficacy of prayer."

He taught, said they, doctrines tending to sedition; as, that the magistrate ceaseth to be a magistrate whilst he is under mortal sin; and that it is lawful for the people to chastise their princes whenever they commit any fault. This accusation is only founded upon this, that Wicklef put the king and all other inferior magistrates in mind, that they did not bear the sword in vain. He saith,

"If a king fails to do his duty, and despiseth the engagements that lie upon him to govern his subjects well, that he is not properly nor truly king, that is to say, he doth not perform the duty of a king;" *perdens nomen officii et ordinis in effectum*; "losing in effect the name of his office and order:" which are the very terms of Bracton, the most renowned lawyer of England, who was never accused of endeavoring to incline the people to rebellion.

They accused him of not having the modesty that a Divine ought to have, and that he was too much given to raillery.

I grant that when he was a young man he was blamed for this fault, which he returned in a very edifying manner.

"I take God to witness," saith he, "that I principally intend the glory of God, and the good of the Church, out of a veneration for the Scripture, and observance of the law of Christ; but if with this intention there may have crept in any sinister aim of vain-glory, worldly profit, and desire of revenge, I am sorry for it, and by the grace of God shall endeavor to avoid it for the time to come."

They accused Wicklef that he was wont to dissemble his opinions, to avoid the danger which he might otherwise have drawn upon himself. But we may with truth give him this testimony, that he was so little acquainted with dissembling in matters of religion, that he was ready to suffer death for most of the opinions that he maintained against his enemies.

"I am not suspected," saith he, "of being afraid to own these conclusions; it shall appear, by the grace of God, that I am not afraid to answer him and his complices, either to his face or in the Schools. If God will give me a teachable heart, a persevering constancy, and charity towards Christ, towards his Church, and towards the members of the Devil, who tear the Church of Christ, that so I may rebuke them out of pure charity, how glorious a cause should I have to die for!"

They say that his rage against the Church of Rome was because the Archbishop of Canterbury had deprived him of a benefice.

But besides that we cannot build much upon the testimony of Monks, who invented this fable; Wicklef himself protests all along, that he had no particular aim in all his writings, and that he only disputes for the honor of God and the edification of the Church.

Lastly, they objected against him, that he maintained that every creature was God; and that God could not hinder himself from obeying the Devil. But the first part of this objection is ridiculous, and raised by men in a rage, who put a perverse sense upon the following words: "The word [God] is to be taken in a twofold manner, absolutely, Lord of lords; but when it is contracted, or specified by a mark of diminution, so it signifies any good that a man loves most."

And the second part of it is wholly grounded upon his manner of explaining the doctrine of providence in the case of sin; which is a subject wherein it would be an easy matter to prove against the Papists, that they have maintained propositions that sound as ill as any thing of his; and nothing but the spirit of slander can impute it as a crime to Divines, that they make use of some improper expressions in a matter which is so difficult to be handled, without seeming to contradict the ideas which we have of the holiness of God, and his hatred of sin.

CHAPTER 25

That the doctrine of the Albigenses was propagated in Spain, and that it continued there till the Reformation.

Whatever persecutions have been exercised against the Albigenses by their enemies, yet we are not to think that they were ever utterly destroyed. We find that this persecution continued in a manner without interruption, until the time of the Reformation. Frison, a Divine of Paris, in the Life of Spondanus, Bishop of Pamiers, reports, that that Bishop found a Church of them in the Pyrenaean mountains, where they had found a safe retreat from the violence of their persecutors, and where they lived apart by themselves.

We find the same thing also in Spain, where they spread themselves in great numbers. I grant indeed that there they were very cruelly persecuted under the reign of Alphonso, whose edicts against them and the Waldenses are still to be seen: but their calamities were doubled upon them after the Inquisition was set up, which was not long before the middle of the thirteenth century.

But with all this it was thought necessary to employ the pen against them, as well as fire and other torments. This appears from the writings of Lucas Tudensis, who wrote under Gregory IX. and under his successor, and who jumbles and confounds them with other heretics and with the Manichees, to countenance the method of the Inquisition, and to authorize their bloody executions. It appears from the writings of this Lucas Tudensis, that they disputed vigorously against most of those articles which we find fault with in the Church of Rome; and that to convince them, they were obliged to use other methods than those of disputing, that is, direct violence, which indeed they employed in very good earnest; and we perceive by Emericus's book, entitled, *The Directory of the Inquisitors*, that they spared neither craft nor cruelty to surprise them, and bring them to destruction.

Rainaldus tells us, that in the year 1344, one John du Moulin, Inquisitor of the province of Tholouse, prosecuting the Waldenses violently that were settled there, they retired from thence, some into Bearn, and others into Arragon, where they were persecuted at the solicitation of this Inquisitor, who made the Bishop of Pampelona take up arms to suppress them. But yet after all this, we find that the Albigenses were preserved there, and gave no small trouble to the Inquisitors. We have an illustrious testimony hereof in the work of a Friar Inquisitor, of the order of Cordeliers, who wrote in the year 1461 his *Fortalitium Fidei*. In the 11th book, which he entitles, *De Bello Haereticorum*, he sets down these heresies, which he afterwards refutes.

The third heresy is that which some enemies of Christianity do profess, who pretend, that confession has no virtue of its own to procure the remission of his sins to any man. This they prove after this following manner:

First, They say it is clear, that when God pardons sin, he doth it not with any respect to the merit of any man, but of mere grace; whence it follows evidently, that the remission of sins cannot be attributed to a man's confessing of them; for if it were so, we must own that the remission is no longer of free-gift, but that it is a recompense given by God to the merit of him that confesseth.

Secondly, They say, if it be confession that procures a man the pardon of his sins, what will become of that passage in the third chapter of the Epistle to Titus, where it is expressly declared, that God hath saved us of his mercy, and not according to the works of righteousness that we have done? Or how shall we explain that in the ninth of the Romans, that it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy We know, that the first grace that God works in us is the remission of sins: now if this grace be absolutely the effect of the mercy of God, it cannot be the effect of confession, which by consequence is not necessary to salvation.

And having thus endeavored to defend their opinion by reason, they endeavor also to back it by the authority of the Fathers, and quote St. Ambrose, who saith upon Luke, St. Peter wept, because his sorrow was so great, that it did not permit him to speak; we find that he wept, but not that he said any thing; I read his tears, but I find nothing of his confession.

The fourth heresy is of those who acknowledge that we ought to confess, but add, that we are not to confess to man. What need is there, say they, to confess to a man, now under the covenant of grace, seeing that even under the law it was sufficient to confess to God by a single act of contrition? They allege also the authority of St. Chrysostom, who saith, upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, It is not said, that you need publish what your sins are to the world, neither need you accuse yourself before all mankind; you are only enjoined to practise the exhortation of David in the 136th Psalm, That you spread all the parts of, your life in the presence of God, that you confess to him who is your true Judge, and that you rather express your repentance by the secret groans of your conscience, than by the abundance of words: this is the true way to obtain grace from Heaven.

They make use also of another passage of the same Father, were he saith, If thou desirest to have thy sins blotted out, confess them; but if thou beest ashamed to discover them to any body, repeat them every day in the secret of thine heart: it is not necessary to tell them to men; they might, it may be, afterwards reproach thee with them; but declare them rather to God, who only can give thee such a remedy as thou wantest: and though thou shouldest not confess them to him, yet he still sees thee, he was present, and looked upon thee whilst thou didst commit them. From all which he concludes, that we ought to confess our sins only to God. And this detestable heresy, which is practiced in secret assemblies, hath already infected a great number of people.

The sixth heresy is of those who maintain that it is not necessary to confess to a Priest, when a man can confess himself to a layman. The seventh heresy is, that we ought to obey none but God alone. This is the error of a certain arch-heretic, called Waldo, from whom the heretics that we now call Waldenses derive their name. This miserable wretch, without being sent from God, took upon him of his own head to form a new sect; and without the permission of any Bishop, without inspiration, without knowledge or learning, set up for a preacher; so that we may well say of him, as Alanus doth in his book against heretics, that he is a wise man without reason, a prophet without a vision, an apostle without being sent, and a doctor who never had instruction. See here how his followers undertake to defend his heresy.

"We see," say they, "in the fifth chapter of the Acts, that St. Peter and St. John, speaking to the Scribes and Pharisees, tell them, Judge ye whether it be reasonable to obey you rather than God, and not to do what he commands us, because you forbid us?"

Moreover, these heretics maintain, "that if we obey a man when we ought not to obey him, we commit a sin, because then we do not obey God: Samuel," say they, "saith to Saul, in the 15th of the First Book of Samuel, that disobedience (or rebellion) is as the sin of witchcraft."

Now he that addicts himself to witchcraft, doth in a manner renounce God; but he that refuseth to obey a man, doth not therefore commit the sin of witchcraft, which sin is not committed but where a man refuseth to obey God. We ought therefore to obey God, and not man, because in disobeying man we are not guilty of that sin, but only when we disobey God.

The eighth heresy is what these same Waldenses profess, that supposing we ought to obey any man, it must be such a man as is not under sin himself, and that good Priests only have the power of binding and loosing.

This also was one of the errors of John Havel, that is to say, Wicklef, an Englishman, who, amongst many others which he taught, maintained, that a temporal Lord, a Bishop, or Prelate, have no authority as long as they are under mortal sin. And he hath been followed by another fox, who asserted the same thing, John Huss, a Bohemian; and by another viper, Jerome of Prague, who were both of them condemned for heretics in the Council held at Constance in the year 1414, in the presence of Martin V. They say therefore that we ought to be obedient to good Prelates, that is to say, to those who are no less successors of the Apostles in

their lives and conversation, than in their charge and function; but as for those whose life and conversation has nothing in it apostolical, they are hirelings, and no true shepherds: they endeavor to support this their error first, by the words of St. Austin, in his book of Baptism; "That God pardons sins either immediately by himself, or by the members of his Dove, and that the saints can either absolve us of our sins or retain them."

He saith also upon Exodus, speaking of the plate of gold, which was to be always upon the forehead of the High Priest: "This plate was the testimony of a good life, and that he only who hath the testimony of a good life, not in a figure, but in truth and reality, can forgive sins."

So likewise St. Gregory declares, "That they only in this world have the power of binding and loosing, so as the Apostles had, who retain their doctrine, and imitate their examples."

And Origen, speaking of the power of St. Peter, saith, that the same is also granted to those who imitate him, because all those that follow the footsteps of St. Peter can also lawfully bind and loose. Lastly, It is said in Malachi, Chapter 2. I will curse your blessings; and in Ezekiel, Chapter 13. Wo to those that quicken the dead souls, and who declare those dead that do not die. If God, say the heretics, do curse the blessing of wicked Pastors, and declares that the souls which they pretend to quicken do not live; how can he communicate his grace through their channel?

The ninth heresy is professed by the same heretics, who maintain, that it is neither the office nor the order, but only the merit of a good life, which confers the power of binding and loosing, of consecrating and blessing; so that this is their conclusion: The merit of a good and holy life, say they, is of greater efficacy to confer upon any one the right of consecrating and blessing, of binding and loosing, than the order or office: and therefore they have not received any orders; yet they believe themselves to be just, and to have the merits of the Apostles, and so they take upon them to bless as the Priests do, and say, that they can consecrate, bind, and loose: because it is the merit, and not the office, that confers this power. And because they pretend to be the Apostles' vicegerents, they say, that their merit gives them this charge. In this it is that they chiefly oppose the faith of the Church, and declare themselves to be heretics. But they endeavor to defend their heresy by the authority of Esicius, who saith, that the Priests do not bless by their own authority, but only because they represent Jesus Christ; and that it is because Christ is in them, that they can bestow their plenary benediction. And they say, moreover, that not only a Priest, but every one that hath Christ in himself, and represents him in his life, as Moses did, has the power of conferring blessings.

The tenth heresy is likewise taught by the same heretics, who maintain that the dispensations or indulgences which a Bishop grants at the consecration of a church, or upon any other occasion, are not of any value. Their reason is this; Suppose, say they, that a man be obliged to a penance of three years, at the consecration of a church, and one Bishop releases him of a third part of his penance; a second and third Bishop may do the like, and thus for three half-pence a man shall be released of this three years' penance: and which is more, these sorts of dispensations are unjust, for there is no proportion between a half-penny or a crown, and one whole year's penance.

The eleventh heresy is, that the prayers which are made for the dead, by those who are in any mortal sin, are unprofitable. For, say these heretics, how can these prayers do any service to the dead, since they can do none at all to those who make them? Can prayers, which are hurtful to them that make them, be of any advantage to the person for whom they are designed? Item, in 3 q. in gravioribus, it is said, When a judge is solicited for his favour to a malefactor, by any one that he hath no liking to, it serves only to incense him so much the more, and to make him pronounce a more severe sentence: so in like manner, if any man prays without devotion, it is the same thing as if he desired his own condemnation; for how can any man, whose very prayer is sin, obtain by that prayer any good thing for his neighbor? or how can he, whose prayer deserves nothing at the hand of God but punishment, pray profitably for another, seeing God saith to the sinner, Psalm 49. What hast thou to do to declare my statutes, or why dost thou take my covenant into thy mouth? They call also reason to their assistance; When a Priest, say they, celebrates the Mass, he being in mortal sin, the action that he doth is evil, and deserves eternal punishment, and by consequence he cannot merit for another the pardon of his sins, because it is impossible to merit good and evil, reward and punishment, by the self-same action. They quote the canon law also, which forbids us to assist at the Mass of a Priest, who we are sure keeps a concubine. They prove likewise, by another authority, that men

ought not to pray or sing Psalms in the Church, as long as they are under mortal sin. The twelfth heresy is of those who deny purgatory, and who say, that it is a mere invention of the Church to make the people give alms and offerings, and to be at the charge of pompous funerals for the souls of the deceased, or other things of that nature.

I confess he does not mention the Albigenses by name, and that he confounds these pretended heresies of the Albigenses with others that are much more heinous, and some that were peculiar to some few Monks, and that he attributes some of them in particular to the Vaudois, as if they had been proper to them only.

But one may justly imagine that this Monk, who compiled this work from the writings of other Monks or Doctors of the Church of Rome, had his eye upon the Albigenses, because he acquaints us that he follows Alanus, and that he copies his arguments. Now we know that Alanus wrote against the Waldenses and Albigenses, as the manuscript titles of his books inform us, though, like the author of the Fortalitium Fidel, he confounds them in his treatise with the Arians, Manichees, and other pernicious heretics, to render the Waldenses and Albigenses suspected of defending all those heresies which he opposes.

It may be thought strange perhaps, that this Monk did not imitate Alanus, in attributing to the Albigenses the rejecting of transubstantiation, and the consequents thereof; but the wonder will cease, if we consider, that he designed hereby to deprive the Jews, against whom he disputes, of an advantage which they might reasonably draw from some Christians rejecting that opinion, though they owned Jesus Christ to be the Messiah, and the books of the New Testament to be of Divine authority at the same time; and therefore he rather chose to refute the arguments against transubstantiation, as coming from the mouths of the Jews, than as objections made by the Albigenses.

And indeed, except the tenth argument of the Jews against transubstantiation, which supposes the Christians who teach this doctrine to be no better than brute beasts, as not having sense enough to know that Jesus Christ, being a Jew by birth, could not, by the circumstances of his institution of the Eucharist, intend any thing but a figurative meaning, as opposed to a real, and that his Apostles, being Jews likewise, could not form any other meaning in all this ceremony, but such as was figurative; there is scarce any other which this Monk hath not borrowed from the disputes which the Albigenses and Vaudois have held with those of the Romish party.

We cannot but look upon Petrus Oxoniensis, a Doctor of Salamanca in the year 1479, as a disciple of the Albigenses in divers points, especially those nine conclusions which this author was forced to retract by Sixtus IVth's order, who authorized the Archbishop of Toledo to condemn them. Any man that reads these nine propositions which Caranza sets down, would think that it was only these opinions that offended the Archbishop of Toledo; but if we will but read the bull of Sixtus IV. which has been published by Alphonsus a Castro, we shall find that this Doctor opposed many other points of Popery. The Pope's words, which are very remarkable, are these: *Et alias propositiones, quas propter earum enormitatem, ut illi qui de eis notitiam habent obliviscantur earum, et qui de eis notitiam non habent, ex praesentibus, non instruantur in eis, silentio praetermittendas duximus.*

"And there are other propositions which are of so foul a nature, that we think it convenient to pass them over in silence, that so those who know them may forget them, and those that do not know them, may not be instructed in them by these our letters."

CONCLUSION

These are the remarks I thought fit to make upon the history of the Churches of the Albigenses. I suppose the reader will own that I have deduced their succession from the Apostles, and their independence on the see of Rome with care enough, though the barbarity of the enemies of the truth has done its utmost endeavors to abolish all the monuments, which these illustrious witnesses of it had left in these dioceses.

Neither do I believe, that the Bishop of Meaux will have any pretense for the future, to accuse them of Manicheism, nor to reproach the Protestants, that they can find no other predecessors in antiquity, but a parcel of men whose doctrine and lives were equally execrable. Nothing but a spirit animated with such a rage and fury as produced those crusades, can obstinately maintain such horrid calumnies, after all that we have here alleged for their justification.

I might perhaps have been more particular in the accounts which I have given of the bad construction the Inquisitors have put upon their belief: but besides that I have sufficiently discovered the injustice of these ministers of hell; who is there amongst the Protestants, nay, amongst the very Papists themselves, that is not fully convinced of the iniquity and profound malice of these hearts of tigers; who, under the name of defenders of the Christian faith, have racked their brains to blacken the most innocent lives of the most religious Christians; and who have made it their diversion to exterminate them by the most dismal torments? The Bishop of Meaux may write as long as he pleases to maintain these diabolical calumnies: I am persuaded, that if any equitable members of his communion will take the pains to compare the carriage of the heathens towards the primitive Christians, with the behavior of his Church under Innocent III. and Gregory IX. against the Albigenses; and the patience of the Albigenses, slandered and persecuted by the Church of Rome, with the condition of the primitive Church, persecuted and slandered by the heathens, they will find it as difficult to look upon the Church of Rome as the daughter of the primitive Church, as it will be easy for them to acknowledge the Albigenses as the genuine offspring of those primitive Christians.

I did not think it necessary for my design, to tie myself step by step to every particular, which I might justly have found fault with in the book where the Bishop of Meaux handles the History of the Albigenses: it is an endless labor to trace a man that follows false guides, and who hath nothing new besides the art and turn of expression: and because the naked truth hath always the better of works of this nature, it is sufficient to set it in a clear light, for the extinguishing that false lustre which men bestow upon lies, by ornaments put upon them only to hide their deformity. And it is my hope after all, that as God hath illustriously displayed the care of his providence, in raising the Church of Piedmont from those ruins under which the spirit of persecution thought for ever to have buried it; so he will be pleased to vouchsafe the same protection to those desolate flocks, whom the violence of the Romish party hath constrained to dissemble their faith, by making a show of embracing the Roman religion, to avoid the extremities of their persecution.

One would think that that God, who hath wrought so many wonders for their preservation, so many ages together; and who even then, when they seemed reduced to nothing by the bloody vigilance of the Inquisitors, who age after age have gleaned this field, after the barbarous rage of the crusades was over, should be unwilling to suffer this oppressed light to be wholly extinguished, but that he will make these his witnesses rise from their graves, now after the Church of Rome has signalized her joy for their death and destruction.

God of his great mercy be pleased to restore to these afflicted flocks the same joy and the same comfort which their ancestors felt at the time of the Reformation, when they gave such public evidence of their zeal, and entered by crowds into the bosom of the reformed Church, whose principles they had maintained so many ages before the Reformation; and to open the eyes of their persecutors, giving them grace to acknowledge, that they fight against God, whilst they strive to force men's consciences, and to engage the people to own that religion as divine, which is only the product of human policy, the very sink of the corruptions of these last times, and the offspring of the spirit of error.

EXTRACTS OF SEVERAL TRIALS OF SOME PRETENDED HERETICS IN THE DIOCESE OF SARUM, TAKEN OUT OF AN OLD REGISTER.

In the name of the holy Trinite, Fadir, Son, and Holy Goste, his blessed Modir, and al the holy compeny of hevyn; we Austyn Stere, of... Herry Benette of Spene, William Brigger of Thachum, Richard Hignell, William Priour, and Richard Goddard of Newbery, and every of us severally in the diocess of Sarum, gretely noted, defamed, detecte, and to you, reverend Fadir in God, Thomas, by God's grace, Bishop of Sarum, our Jugge and Ordinarie, denownced for untrew belevyng men; and also that we and every of us shold hold, afferme, teche, and defende openly and prively heresies, errours, singular opinions, and false doctrines, contrarie to the commen doctrine of our Modir holy Church; and with subtilites, eville soundyng, and deceyveable to the eres of true sympille understanding Cristen people, which be to us and every of us severly now by your auctorite procedyng of office promoted, judicially objected.

First, That I Augustyn Stere, have hold affermed and seyde, that the Church of Criste is but a sinagoge, and an house of marchandise, and that Pristis be but scribis and Pharissais, not profyting the Christen people, but disseyvyng them.

Item, I have hold affermed, taught and beleved, that in the Sacramente of the Auter is not the very body of Criste. Farthermore, shewing and seying that Pristis may bie xxx suche goddis for one peny, and will not selle one of them but for two penys.

Item, I have misbeleved, and to dyvers manyfestly shewed that ymages of seynts be not to be worshipped afir the doctrine of a boke of Commandments, which I have had in my keping, wherein is wreten, that no man shall worship eny thing made or graven with mannys hand, attending the words of the same litterally, and not inclynynge to the sense of the same.

Item, I have spoken and diverse tymes shewed that Pristis be the enemies of Christe.

Item, I have belevyd, said and taught, that St. Petir was never Priste, but a little before his deth. Ferthermore, shewing that Simeon Magos geve hym his tonsure of prysthode, and in spyte of hym, Goddis Vicar contempnyng hys power, called hym a panyer maker.

Fyrst, That I, Herry Benett, have hold and kepte this opinion, that pilgremaggis be not to be made moeved for this cause, for only God is to be warsshyped, and so not themmagis of sayntis, insomoch that I wold never goo a pilgremage but onys, and I have oftyn tymes reproved such as wold spend their money in pilgremage doying, seing thei myght better spend hit at home.

Item, I have not belevyd stedfastly in the Sacrament of Thauter, seying of hit this wise, that if there were thre Hostys in one pikkis, one of theim consecrate, and the odir not consecrate, a mowse woll as well ete that Hoste consecrate as the odir twayn unconsecrate; the which he myght not, if there were the very body of Criste, for if there were the Fadir, Son, and Holy Goste, he myght not ete theym.

Fyrste, That I, William Brigger, have erred and mysbeleved in the Sacramente of the Auter, seyng and holdyng that there shuld not be the very body of Criste, so taught and enformed in this same grete errour and heresie, by one Richard Sawyer, late of Newbery.

Item, I have spoke and hold ayenste the sacramente of Pennance, seing in this wise; If I have take a manis goode, or stole his cove, and be sory in harte, I may as well be saved as though I were shreven thereof, for it is inowe to be shryve to God.

Item, I have held and seyde ayenste the doctrine of Prystys, affermyng of them, that all Prystes techeth a false and a blynd way to bryng us all in to the myer. Ferthermore addyng herto, and seyng, howe may it be

that blynde William Harper may lede anodir blynde man to Newbery, but both fall yn to the dyche, so dothe all thes Pristis to bryng us alle to dampnation.

Fyrste, That I, Richard Hignel, have hold and mysbelevd of long tyme in the Sacramente of the Auter, seyng that Christe offer'd to Simeon is the very Saeramente of Thauter, so meanyng and belevyng in myn opinion, that the Sacramente in form of brede shuld not be very Godde, but only Criste hymselffe in hevyn is the Sacrament, and none odir, and so I have mysbelevyd and continewd in this errour and heresie unto this tyme of examnacion.

Item, I have be adherente and associat with hereticks abjured, by whos doctrine I have erred, as I have afore spoken.

Fyrste, That I, William Priour, have said and hold ayenst the auctorite and power of Pristis, callyng them scribis, Pharisies, and thenmyes of Criste, not teching but disseyving the Cristen people.

Item, I have belevyd and divers tymes shewid that ymagis ofseynts be not to be wurshyped, nether oblacions to be made unto them, seyng and holding no such thing to be wurshipped that is graven or made with manys hande.

I, Richard Goddard, in long tyme here before have had grete dought howe God myght be in forme of brede in Thauter, amoste syn the yeres of discrecion; and nowe in fewe yeres thought and utterly belevd that inasmoch as God is in hevyn he shuld not be in the Sacramente of Thauter, and so in this errour have continewd unto the tyme of this my present abjuracion.

Thes articles, and every of them afore rehersed, and to us Austyn Stere, Herry Benet, William Brigger, Richard Hignell, William Priour, and Richard Goddard, and to every of us severelly by you judicially objected, we and every of us singularly openly knowlege our selffe, and confesse of our fre wille to have hold, lerned and belevyd, and so have taught and affermyd to odir, which articles and every of them, as us concerneth severelly, we and every of us understand and beleve heresies, and contrary to the comen doctrine and determination of the universalle Church of Criste, and confesse us and every of us here to have be heretikes, lerners and techers of heresies, errours, opinions, and false doctrines, contrarie to the Cristen feith. And forasmoch as it is so that the lawes of the Church of Criste and holy canons of saynts be grounded in mercy, and God wol not the deth of a synner, but that he be converted and seve. And also the Church closeth not her lappe to him, that woll retorne: we therefor and every of us, willing to be partiners of this forseid mercy, forsake and renounce all thes articles afore rehersed as us concerneth particularly, and confesse them to be heresies, errours, and prohibite doctrine: and nowe contrite, and fully repentyng them all and every of them, judicially and solemly theira forsake, abjure, and wilfully renounce for evermor, and not only them, but all odir heresies, errours, and dampnable doctrines contrary to the determination of the universall Church of Criste: also that we and every of us shall never hereafter be to eny such persons or person, favorers, counselors, maintainers, or of eny such prively or openly; but if we or eny of us knowe eny such hereafter, we and every of us shall denownce and disclose them to you reverend Fadir in God, your successors or officers of the same, or els to such persons of the Church as hath jurisdiction on the persons so fawty, so help us God and all holy Evangelis, submytting us and every of us openly, not coacte but of our fre wille to the payn, rigour and sharpness of the lawe, that a man relapsed owght to suffre in suche case, if we or eny of us ever do or hold contrarie to this our presente abjuracion in parte, or the hole therof: in witnesse whereof, we all and every of us severally subscribe with our hands, makying a cross, and requir all Cristen men in generall her presente, to record, and witnes ayenst us and every of us, and this our presente confession and abjuracion, if we or eny of us from this day forwards offende or do contrarie to the same; and ye masters her presente.....

Lecta et facta fuit ista abjuracio coram reverendo in Christo Patre et Domino Thoma, permissione divina Sarum Episcopo, in ecclesia parochiali Sancti Johannis de Wyndsour nova, per supra scriptos Augustinum Stere, Henricum Benet, Willielmum Brigger, Richardum Hignell, Willielmum Priour, et Richardum Goddard, xxviii die mensis Januarii, anno Domini millesimo cccc nonagesimo, pracsentibus tunc ibidem venembilibus viris magistris Laurencio Cokks, Edmundo Martyn, Johanne Mayhowe decretorum Doctoribus, Daye sacrac Theologiac Professore, Radulpho Hethcote Canonico ecclesiac cathedralis Sarum, Willielmo Thynlawe Vicario perpetuo ecclesiac praefatae, Briano et Willielmo Birley

Artium Magistris, Thoma Clerke in Legibus Baccalaureo, et Johanne Wely Scriba et Registrario per dictum Reverendum Patrem in hac parte assumpto, et multis aliis.

Quibus quidem die et loco idem Reverendus Pater injunxit praefato Augustino Stere, in parte poenitentiae suae, quod ipse Augustinus nudus tibias pedes et caput, corpore toga et camisia ac foemoralibus lineis tantummodo indutus, unum fasciculum, sive fagotum super humerum suum, et unum facem Anglice a bronde in manu ejus gestans diebus et locis infra scriptis, viz. die Sabbati, xxix die mensis Januarii, anno praedicto, circa mercatum ville de Wyndesour nova, ubi et quando fuerit populi multitudo; die dominica extunc sequenti, viz. ultimo die mensis ejusdem, circa ecclesiam parochialem beatæ Mariæ Rading; die Sabbati, quinto die Februarii, circa mercatum de Newbery; die dominica extunc sequenti, circa ecclesiam parochialem ibidem; die dominica prima quadragesimæ in ecclesia cathedrali Sarum; die Martis extunc sequente, circa mercatum ibidem, cæterisque diebus diversis per loca, scil. per monasteria de Seme, Milton, Abbottesbery, Abyndon et Shirborn, necnon circa mercatum ibidem Sarum diocæseos coram processionibus circa ecclesias, monasteria et loca praedicta, aut in eisdem locis prout acris temperies permiserit, ut moris est faciendis more humilis poenitentis incederet, finitisque hujusmodi processionibus vel cum ab aliquo Curatorum hujusmodi ecclesiarum sive locorum proceditur ad pulpitem quibusdam literis in Anglico scriptis errores et opiniones dampnabiles praedicti Augustini et ipsius abjuracionem in se continentibus, lectis et declaratis per ipsum Augustinum alta et intelligibili voce sua declarando, exponendo et recitando, ac confitendo publice, prout in eisdem literis continetur; de qua quidem poenitentia per ipsum Augustinum bene et fideliter pemcta prout sibi mandatum fuerit per curatos et alios de quibus supra sit mencio praefatus Reverendus Pater et Dominus plenarie et sufficienter fuerit certificatus; unde postea idem Reverendus Pater in tempore certificationis hujusmodi sibi factae in complementum poenitentiae suae injunxit quod singulis diebus vitae suae coram ymagine crucifixi genuflectendo diceret devote, quinquies Orationem Dominicam, et quinquies salutationem angelicam, et semel Symbolum Apostolorum, et quod injuncto die parassepthes et vigiliis beatæ Mariæ per unum annum integrum immediate sequentem in pane et aqua. Item, quod lapso termino.... dierum per dictum Reverendum Patrem assignato ad villam de Newbery, vel ad aliquem locum situatum infra septem milliaria a villa de Newbery praedicta non accideret, nisi ex licentia praefati Reverendi Patris petita primitus et obtenta.

THE END